NOTE TO USERS

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been scanned at the request of the author. They are available for consultation in the author's university library.

158 - 162

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI®

University of Alberta

A Question of Sim-pathy;
Encounters with Kobayashi Yoshinori

By

Sean Koji Callaghan ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Department of East Asian Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall, 2005

Library and Archives Canada

Published Heritage Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et Archives Canada

Direction du Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 0-494-09027-8
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 0-494-09027-8

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

The coming being is whatever being.

-Giorgio Agamben, *The Coming Community*

The problem is how to extend sympathy.

-Gilles Deleuze, *Empiricism and Subjectivity*

The night they showed the POWs and the dead soldiers – Al Jazeera showed 'em – it was powerful cause America doesn't show those kinds of images. Most of the news in America won't show gory images and this showed American soldiers in uniform strewn about a floor – a cold tile floor – and it was, ah, revolting. It was absolutely revolting. It made me sick to my stomach. And then what hit me was the night before there had been some kind of bombing in Basra and Al Jazeera had shown images of the people and they were equally, if not more, horrifying. The images were – I remember having seen it in the Al Jazeera office and thought to myself "Wow, that's- that's gross. That's that's that's bad," and going away and probably eating dinner or something, and, y'know, it didn't affect me as much. So the impact it had on my – me realizing that I just saw people on the other side and those Al Ja- people Al Jazeera off Al Jazeera Office must have felt the way I was feeling that night and it upset me on a profound level that I wasn't as bothered as much the night before. It makes me hate war, but it doesn't make me believe we're in a world that can live without war, yet.

-Lieutenant Josh Rushing, Press Officer for U.S. Military Forces in Iraq during the "Shock and Awe" Campaign, quoted in Jehane Noujaim's documentary on Al-Jazeera's coverage of the Iraq War, *Control Room.*

Abstract

In this paper I focus on the works of Japanese manga writer and social critic Kobayashi Yoshinori. Kobayashi Yoshinori has been named a neo-nationalist, ultraconservative, and historical revisionist writer by several of his critics. In order to guard against the danger of essentializing my understanding of his work according to these labels, I have used what I call a *sim-pathetic tactic* of approach that requires an admission of partiality on the side of both critic and subject of criticism. By superimposing my self in the estimated virtual position of the subject, I explore the possibility of encountering him and his work, not as a single, unified entity, but as a nexus of interrelating vectors of signification. In doing so, I hope to question the validity of using such an approach on someone like Kobayashi.

Acknowledgments

My thanks go to Dr. Karyn Ball, and Dr. Sourayan Mookerjea for all their help during the research and writing of this paper. Special thanks must go to my supervisor, Dr. Janice Brown, whose patience, enthusiasm, and critical guidance were indispensable to my research for this paper and for my studies as a graduate student in the Department of East Asian Studies.

Also, a warm fuzzy-like thanks to my sister for providing me with the essentials of life - food, shelter, and Friday night movie nights - and for putting up with my bear-hair mornings and general grouchiness over the last year of writing this thesis.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

About Encountering..... 8

Section I. Kobayashi Yoshinori: Life and Work 11

A Short Biographical Sketch..... 11

Protests..... 27

Section II. Critique: The Sim-pathetic Tactic 34

A Move Away from Strategic Criticism..... 34

A Critique of Criticism..... 40

The Negation of Life..... 46

Defining Sim-pathy..... 56

Section III. Encounters with Kobayashi: The Naqoykatsi Effect 66

Naqoykatsi..... 66

1. Kobayashi, The Fascist..... 71

    a. Robert Paxton..... 73
    b. Roger Griffin and Stanley Payne..... 80
    c. Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari..... 87

2. Kobayashi, the Rebel..... 96

    a. Parody..... 96
    b. Anti-ideology..... 103
    c. A Voice for the Voiceless..... 109

3. Kobayashi, The Manga Artist..... 117

A Few Last Words 139

Bibliography 144

Appendix A – Original Japanese Text 150

Appendix B – Image of Kobayashi's Manga 158

Introduction

My first encounter with the works of Japanese manga writer and social critic Kobayashi Yoshinori came by way of recommendation. I was working as an English teacher in a small suburb outside of Tokyo. The school at which I was working was one of the many English Language Factories that crowd train stations all over Japan with their billboards and neon signs promising safe foreign encounters at discount prices. Most of the schools I worked at, and over the years I worked for quite a few of them, were very systematic in their control of human relations. As though designed according to a Foucauldian template, the schools centralized management over the organization of "tout les mots et les choses." Lines of power were drawn strictly according to practices aimed at maximizing institutional control over the production of language. Teachers, being the focal point where things and words folded over each other, were the main focus of this institutional control. We were given strict instructions during the initial training sessions on how we would run the classes, what we would say, and when we would say it. We were told to refrain from personal or irrelevant remarks that would only be a digression from the goal of language production. We were instructed to keep our language terse and specific in order to lower our teacher talking time (TTT) rates. Every day we were assigned specific teaching stations, either a table in the main teaching area, or one of the windowless rooms at the back of the school. Students came to us in groups of 3 or 4 at

regulated 40-minute intervals according to a set schedule everyday. Though the schedule was set, the students themselves took classes at random. For most of them, language learning was an interstitial activity, done in the random spaces of time available in a day already divided between family, work, and social duty. Because of the random nature of our daily encounters with students, we teachers discovered it was pointless to try to establish consistent relationships with our clientele. Instead of designing our instructional strategies to fit individual identities, we learned to distinguish students according to category: salaryman, OL (Office Lady), housewife, college student, child. Each category brought with it its own specific set of linguistic problems. We approached each category of person with a different set of assumptions. Teachers who wanted to give their lessons a personal touch were encouraged to draw name charts on scraps of paper that corresponded to seating arrangements. By the end of the day, these scraps of paper littered the floors and trashcans all over the school.

***

Kazuhiko,[1] the friend who would eventually introduce me to the works of Kobayashi Yoshinori, was one of the few exceptions to the rule. He was an executive working for one of the largest auditing firms in Japan. Appropriately enough, money afforded him the luxury to override school policy, so he could define his education according to his specific wants and needs. He preferred to have lessons at regular times, from ten to noon on Saturdays. He was a soft-spoken man. He rarely made eye contact in our first few classes together. This apparent shyness was magnified by his lack of confidence in his English speaking abilities. Consequently, he asked for private lessons with a single teacher. He asked specifically to be taught by an American since the

[1] In order to keep his identity private, I have used the pseudonym "Kazuhiko" in place of his real name.

majority of English speakers he had to deal with at work were visitors from his firm's U.S. counterpart. I was chosen to teach him, because I was the closest approximation to an American working at the school on Saturdays. By that time, I was used to the cultural misrecognition and took the blow to my "Canadian" ego in stride.

It was inevitable that our lives would begin to spill into the lessons. As one Saturday passed to the next, our relationship slowly expanded beyond the barriers of regulated speech patterns, and pre-determined lesson flow. The strict guidelines for teaching that had been drilled into me during training couldn't hold against the more complex dynamic of a relationship unfolding. Keywords like TTT rates, language production, and goal digression had no place in the logic of a simple conversation. In stark contrast to the mechanized lessons I taught throughout the week, my lessons with Kazuhiko were mingled with stories about our lives, discussions about our beliefs and ideas. He sometimes gave me an insider's view of issues centered on the state of the Japanese economy. He often spoke of his love of classical music, especially Mozart's *Die Zauberflöte*, and Beethoven's *6th Symphony*. He told me stories about his family life - weekly jogs along the river with his son, his son's stress over middle school entrance exams, his son's future. He also spoke of his love of reading books on Japanese history. It was during one of our discussions about Japan's role in the Second World War that he referred me to Kobayashi Yoshinori's *On War* (Sensōron, 戦争論) manga series. With reserved enthusiasm, he told me it would be a good introduction to the issues that were still being debated today concerning Japan's role in World War II. He said Kobayashi's manga would give me a better account than other more traditional scholarly sources of

why the Japanese were involved in the war. Besides it was in manga form. The pictures would make it more accessible.

Intrigued, I scribbled the name and title of the book on my sheet of scrap paper. The following day, I went to the bookshop and bought myself a copy. Upon opening its pages, however, I found myself confronted by Kobayashi's distinct writing-style that mixed classical and colloquial Japanese with the standard form. Though the pictures were captivating, the text was well above my reading abilities at the time, and I found it inaccessible. I put it aside for another day.

***

After a year of Saturday's, Kazuhiko's contract with the school ran out. On his last day of private lessons, we spent our time talking about strategies he could use to keep up his language ability outside of the school. We exchanged contact information and parting pleasantries, and just before leaving he gave me a gift. By this point, I had become familiar with the Japanese custom of gift giving. I had given and received gifts on numerous occasions. I was aware of the long string of dates that reinforced the custom on a national scale – お正月 (Oshōgatsu, New Year's Day), Valentine's Day, White Day,[2] 御盆 (O-bon, The Festival of the Dead), etc.[3] I had learned to swallow my distaste for the ubiquity of over-packaged products. I remember buying a box of mini-donuts from the convenience store near my house and discovering, much to my irritation, that each donut was individually sealed in plastic; even mini-donuts were packaged under the assumption that they would be given away. I had also heard story after story of

---

[2] The tradition of gift giving on Valentine's Day differs slightly in Japan from the tradition in Western countries. On Valentine's Day women are expected to give gifts to men, but not vice versa. Men are expected to give gifts to those women from whom they received gifts a month later on "White Day."

[3] Harumi Befu provides an interesting analysis of the custom of gift giving in Japan in her paper, "Gift Giving in Japan," *Monumenta Nipponica*, 23:3/4 (1968) 445-456.

wealthy students giving extravagant gifts to their teachers: designer watches, DVD players, envelopes of cash. If I had learned anything from these latter stories, it was that the circulation of debt between language student and English teacher was grafted onto laws of capital exchange, and gratitude was more often than not expressed in extravagant displays of wealth. As uncomfortable as I may have been with this sense of gift circulation, in all honesty, when Kazuhiko offered me his gift, I had to suppress a sudden upsurge of guilty greed. I eagerly opened the package.

Inside I found gifts wrapped in an altogether different logic. They were nothing extravagant. He had not chosen to overwhelm me with the lavishness of his buying power. He had, instead, chosen gifts that communicated something more personal: two classical CD's - Mozart's *Die Zauberflöte*, and Beethoven's *6th Symphony*. These were the very CD's he had in his own home, he told me. These were the very CD's that he had spoken so fondly of in our classes together.

I was completely unprepared for this kind of generosity. What else could I do, but thank him? I shook his hand as warmly as I could, and saw him to the door.

***

Months passed. I had finished my contract with the school in Japan and was back in Canada starting my first semester of Graduate Studies. My graduate supervisor had asked to speak with me about my plans for my Master's thesis, so I stopped by his office after class. I remember sitting in the chair across from his desk nervously fidgeting while he finished typing a few last sentences on his desktop computer. I was somewhat overwhelmed by the situation. This was my first informal discussion with my supervisor, and aside from a vague desire to prove I wasn't completely inept as an academic, I had

very little idea as to where I wanted to direct my studies. To keep myself from melting into a small pool of lukewarm apprehension, I ran my eyes over the shelves and shelves of books that lined almost every spare inch of wall space around me until they came to rest on a familiar site.

"Oh," I blurted, pointing to the three volumes of Kobayashi Yoshinori's *On War* series tossed haphazardly on the bottom shelf next to me. "I've got those. A friend recommended them."

The three volumes were a warm reminder of my lessons with Kazuhiko that helped calm my nerves. I was on my way to relaxing into a reminiscent smile when I noticed my supervisor looking at me with a quizzical expression on his face.

"Oh," he said, "Is your friend a fascist?"

Up until that moment, I had pictured Kobayashi in my mind as a benevolent, well-educated Japanese historian dedicated to opening up discussion on Japan's wartime past to people young and old in a manner that was both entertaining and accessible. The Kobayashi that was then described to me, the Kobayashi I soon discovered upon reading his work, cut a figure far different from these premature imaginings. The Kobayashi I encountered was a writer engaged in a project to revitalize Japan's pre-war nationalist spirit, a project dedicated to a historical revision of Japan's wartime past with the purpose of redefining the Japanese war criminal as a war hero while calling into question accusations of Japanese responsibility for the atrocities committed all over East Asia. The Japanese were not oppressors, they were victims of an elaborate post-war conspiracy of the Allied powers and it was time to shake off the shackles of guilt and self-hate that had encumbered Japanese society since the beginning of U.S. occupation. It was time to

bring back the days of the self-sacrificing Japanese warrior spirit (大和魂、yamato damashii). It was time for a new era of fascism to take hold, so that the next generation of Japanese people could enjoy the fruits of the moral legacy left to them by their forefathers, the legacy of a people blessed with a distinct and unique sense of what was righteous and true. At least, this was the kind of message he seemed to be putting forth at first glance.

Not long after my unsettling discovery about Kobayashi's work, I received an email from Kazuhiko. He asked how I was doing, told me he and his family were fine, and wished me success in my academic career. He then went on to inform me of some good news that had come to him recently. He had received a 695 on his TOEIC exam, fifty points higher than he had anticipated. I couldn't help but feel some sense of pride in helping him surpass his goals. I wrote him a reply congratulating him on his score. Told him I was doing fine. Told him about being back in Canada, about readjusting to academic life, about my life in general.

I didn't send the email right away. I remember feeling temporarily paralyzed by the clash of contradictions in my head between my memories of the person, and my newly acquired knowledge of the beliefs to which he may have subscribed. Was he, indeed, a fascist? Knowing what I did, did I have a responsibility to act in a particular manner? Was I supposed to take a moral stand right then and there? What would it mean to send this email?

Eventually, though, something had to be done. I couldn't sit there forever.

I hit "send."

***

About Encountering

Kazuhiko is the living memory of a very real conundrum that I am continually faced with in the passing moments of my everyday life. Even if I don't rely on a stable identity to piece together the logic of my own subjective narrative, identity will still come to me before encountering another person. As Gilles Deleuze points out in his work *Empiricism and Subjectivity*, "the mind is not subject, it is subjected."[4] The individual is "subjected," while at the same time this subjectivity organizes itself to transcend the aleatory moments of empirical experience.[5] The very stars shift, and "I" become in relation to Kazuhiko, Stephen Daedalus, Tōjō Hideki, my sister, my mother, my friends and acquaintances. Before this, I become within the rules of signification that make it possible to begin writing their name to memory. In that relation entire worlds of understanding and misrecognition are created, then vanish, shift, and vanish again. I am left with the remnant of myself, and the memories of those I have encountered to connect by association a story that will put me at ease, make me feel safe in their company, in this language, in my self. These other people, however, do not, cannot, occupy the exact same discursive location within which I find the means to speak with them. There will always be discrepancies. And these discrepancies give rise to a profound conundrum: as close as another person can come to me through social acts of sympathizing, they will always have to be distanced as another person in order to make their approach possible.

With this in mind, I have to make an important admission. What is at stake for me in writing this paper and dealing with the issues that I will deal with - the

---

[4] Deleuze, Gilles. *Empiricism and Subjectivity; An Essay on Hume's Theory of Human Nature*, trans. Constantin V. Boundas (New York : Columbia University Press, 1991). 31.

[5] Ibid. 26. "The coherent paradox of Hume's philosophy is that it offers a subjectivity which transcends itself, without being any less passive. Subjectivity is determined as an effect; it is in fact an impression of reflection. The mind, having been affected by the principles, turns now into a subject."

subordination of "life" to political ends, the production of "fascist" modes of thinking in Kobayashi's work - has less to do with any kind of indignant anger at what I see to be the continual return in contemporary life of some of the same tropes, and logics of reasoning that wrote the ground upon which fascism and its legacies of atrocity were made possible. Instead, this paper has more to do with my simple, yet disturbing consternation when faced with the awe-full approach of another person. To put it in a different way, if the next person is indeed "whatever" of the coming being, as Giorgio Agamben has written in his work *The Coming Community*,[6] I would very much like to be able to *be welcoming* that being: the person around the corner, the group waiting to be revealed, the stranger in front of me, without any predetermined reliance on a subjectivity of exclusion; in fact, I take this as absolutely necessary in moving out from the shadow of what Agamben indicated as the "sign of fascism" under which we may still be living.[7] Hoping to do this and facing the consequences of doing it, however, involve two different problems. Welcoming the coming community with open arms, holding the door open for "whatever" happens to arrive, is a beautiful notion. As I stand in the presence of whatever's becoming, however, I am reminded that it has, in some ways, already been. Memory, as fashionable as it is to theorize about the ambiguity of its form and function, is inevitable. I have encountered the man around the corner as I am encountering him. I have seen the group already revealed as they are becoming revealed. And I remember that some of them really pissed me off. Some of them were enchanting. Some of them were terrifying. Some have violated bodies, have enchanted gods, have loved, laughed, and hated. Some have killed and been killed. These memories are driven irrevocably

---

[6] Agamben, Giorgio. *The Coming Community*, trans. Michael Hardt (Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1993).
[7] Ibid. 63.

into the substance of my everyday. All of these people live to varying degrees of intensity within the framework of my understanding of their presence, yet none were the overman, or pure becoming, or an ideal. I have memories of meeting the coming community. I have been being the coming community, and I worry that *striving* to be in their and my presence might in some way erase the possibility of our merely having been this being. Is it possible to meet someone, not as I want to meet them, but simply as they are met? At the same time, I also have to worry about how the next manifestation of becoming will be made possible. By engaging in a logic of open-ness to others around me, I have to face the possibility that I may be bridging gaps, and unleashing possibilities, trajectories, bulk vectors of logical displacement that may not be as gentle as I would like them to be. In fact, taking on the responsibility of facing these consequences also means facing the possibility of opening the door to a kind of violence as yet unimagined.

These are just a few of the concerns I mean to address in the following pages. As grandiose or as irrelevant as my ideas may become, however, I would like the reader to keep my story of Kazuhiko in mind. He is the initial trigger that put these issues in play in my life. He is the reason I have chosen the works of Kobayashi Yoshinori as my focus of study. This paper is for him, because, in a way, it is about him, and about me, and how I have tried to reconcile the memory of his company, with the knowledge of his difference.

***

Section I
Kobayashi Yoshinori: Life and Work

A Short Biographical Sketch

I will start with a brief biographical sketch of Kobayashi's life and works before I step foot into the theoretical territory upon which I intend to address his work. I emphasize that this sketch will be brief, and is meant only to serve as the basic skeleton upon which I will build further elaborations on the textual context within which he is writing. As such, this sketch will offer a particular interpretation of Kobayashi (as neo-nationalist, as member and voice for the Society for History Textbook Reform, as a deferred subjectivity) that is the one most often used in criticisms of his work. This is not the only version of Kobayashi that is available, and I will provide alternatives to this first characterization in the final section of this paper when I turn to deal with his work in the manga series *The Arrogantist Manifesto*.

I will also offer an analysis of some of the criticisms that have been written in reaction to his work, so that I can begin mapping out the specific and essential attributes that make my own project distinct from those that have come before. It may seem premature to address criticisms on Kobayashi's work before I have fully laid out the details of my own project, but I have decided to put the cart before the horse in this case so that I can begin locating a few theoretical markers that are essential to understanding why I have chosen the tactic of approach that I have. To put it briefly, I am not concerned as to why Kobayashi is wrong in his depictions of Japan's past, a perspective that seems to predominate the landscape of criticism waged against him, but more

concerned with exploring the possibilities for interpretation available beyond the questions that ask whether he is wrong or right. In order to do this, I will need to take what may seem in some instances as a more sympathetic position on his work than has been taken by those before me. Because Kobayashi is such a controversial figure within Japan and without, by doing so, I put myself in danger of being labeled an apologist for his "neo-fascist" or "neo-nationalist" project. In order to avoid any such misunderstandings, I think it is important that I establish the stakes I believe are involved in this paper early on. I cannot do this without first addressing the criticisms that have already been written in reaction to his work.

But first a few biographical words on the man and his project.

***

Kobayashi Yoshinori is most widely known in Japan as a manga[8] writer. He was born in 1953 in Fukuoka prefecture in Japan, and began writing and publishing manga at a relatively young age. From the age of twenty-two he began to gain popularity with the publication of 東大一直線 *(Tōdai Itchokusen, Beeline to Tōdai)*. Frederik Schodt provides a brief description of this series in his work *Dreamland Japan.*

> The story starred an obnoxious, idiotic young student named Tōru Tōdai, who, like many students in Japan, was obsessed with getting into the University of Tokyo (called "Tōdai" for short). Rather crudely drawn and filled with clever puns and the vulgar jokes that naughty children love (often involving scatology and innocent nudity), it was a major hit in the

[8] In my formal analysis of Kobayashi's texts I have included a segment on defining "manga" according to some of the traditions of pictorial representation that informed its development. See page 117. For now I give the inadequate definition of manga as a kind of Japanese graphic art similar to comic books in North America, but more fully developed in the breadth and scope of themes and topics that it addresses.

> late seventies – a time when people first realized that the proliferation of after-hours cram schools and superheated academic competition among young children was a social problem.[9]

As Schodt notes, from the outset Kobayashi proved himself sensitive to the issues that weighed on the minds of the Japanese public and used it to attract the interest of readers. This would prove to be a talent that would help him achieve the status as one of the most popular, and some would argue the most innovative, manga writers over the past three decades. *Beeline to Tōdai* stayed in publication until 1979.

As popular as *Beeline to Tōdai* became, the fame Kobayashi achieved through this and following projects paled in comparison to the immense popularity gained by his most well-known and well-loved manga series *Obotchamakun*. The series had its first issue published seven years following the publication of the last issue of *Beeline to Tō-dai*. The story followed the exploits of two elementary school boys, the uber-rich Obotchamakun and his friend Shōhei, while they attended classes at a private school in one of the wealthiest neighborhoods in Tokyo. Writing *Obotchamakun* in the final years of Japanese economic prosperity, Kobayashi again managed to tap into the hearts and minds of contemporary Japanese manga readers to give them the kind of comic hero they could enjoy laughing with and at: an extravagantly rich and spoiled young brat. Though the series was permeated with Kobayashi's characteristic over-the-top style of gag writing that relied heavily on bad puns, and feces and penis jokes, the majority of installments depended on the unfurling of a single device: punch-lines hammered home with the excessive display of Obotchamakun's wealth.

---

[9] Schodt, Frederick. *Dreamland Japan; Writings on Modern Manga,* (Berkeley: Stone Bridge Press, 1996) 227.

To give just a few examples, when newcomer and rival rich kid, Blindalley Bigbucks (Fukurōkōji Kanemitsu, 袋小路金満),[10] enters the scene trying to show off his wealth by stepping out of a stretch limousine in a fur coat to protect him from the cold chill of a winter's day, Obotchamakun outdoes him tenfold by arriving at school in swim trunks in the back of a semi-ton truck turned beach-side-tanning-salon complete with sand, servant, cocktails, tropical fish, palm tree, and mermaid (see Figure 1 in images provided in Appendix B). In another episode, Obotchamakun is abducted and held for ransom. When his abductors call up his father asking for $3 million in ransom money, Obotchamakun offers to pay the ransom himself with the jewels and treasures stored in the various orifices of his body. When his captors decide to up the ransom to $300 million dollars, Obotchamakun decides he doesn't want to spend his time waiting to be saved in their dingy home, and offers to put all of them up at the executive suite of the Imperial Hotel. By the time Obotchamakun's location is discovered by the police, his captor's are so impressed and grateful for the luxurious time spent with their magnanimous host, they allow themselves to be carted off in handcuffs with a smile of contentment on their faces.

Relying on his keen ear for wordplay and a talent for overstatement, Kobayashi would manage to transform this single comic device into a 28 volume, 4000+ page manga series that would make him millions of dollars. The series would gain such popularity that it eventually found its way to the airwaves as a popular children's television series.

---

[10] Translations for Japanese titles, names, or sections of text are my own unless otherwise indicated, and I take full responsibility for any mistakes that might appear. I have also provided the original Japanese texts of all the segments I have translated in Appendix A.

Throughout his rise to super-stardom during the 70's and 80's, Kobayashi Yoshinori keeps himself busy with a variety of other smaller projects that help stretch his ability to work in other styles and genres of manga at the same time that he continued to churn out the sophomoric humor with *Bee-Line to Tōdai* and *Obotchamakun*. Over the years, he proves himself adept at writing love-romance manga (*吠えろ純愛 Hoero Junai, "Brute Love"*), superhero manga (*青年ジェット Seinen Jetto, "The Jet Kid"*), sports hero manga (*風雲わなげ野郎 Fuun wanage yarō, "The Wind and the Clouds Ring Kid"*), salaryman manga (*ドン並平Don Namihei, and 愛社一丸はかく働き Aisha Ichimaru wa Kaku Hataraki, "Every-worker Ichimaru Loveworks"*). He even tries his hand at giving somewhat questionable advice through the manga *Listen up! (厳格に聞け ,Genkaku ni Kike)*.

Regardless of the genre of writing in which he works, however, two things remain constant: his fondness for word play, and his love of parody. Though in all of the above-mentioned works Kobayashi makes sure to follow the formats and visual styles of the various genres, he also uses his skill with parody to flip each genre on its head. In *Brute Love*, Kobayashi parodies the shōjo or "young girl" romance story by turning the heroine into a lovesick, sickle-tossing prostitute.[11] In *The Jet Kid*, the boy super-hero's main power lies in his ability to scream loud enough to destroy everything within a five-mile radius. Unfortunately, because of his inability to control his rare talent, he, more often than not, ends by killing the victim as well as the perpetrator. With *Listen up!* Kobayashi provides a parody of the Japanese daytime TV advice show going to great lengths to disguise the identity of the people seeking advice by drawing them with their

[11] See page 97 for further details on *Brute Love*.

eyes covered, and disguising their voice by writing their dialogue in an uncharacteristic font. Over the seventies and eighties, Kobayashi would maintain this light-hearted approach to manga writing, and would profit from it in spades.

The nineties, however, would see an upheaval of the status quo in Japan with the burst of the economic bubble, the end of the Cold War, a shift in Japan-U.S. relations, and the spiraling decay of government as one political scandal after another hit the headlines of all the major newspapers. Kobayashi, sensing a shift in the inclinations of the general public from economic frivolity to moral frugality, would tap into the pulse of the nation and accommodate this darker, more conservative mood with the publication of a different kind of manga. Moving into the realm of serious political commentary and social satire, Kobayashi begins writing the *The Arrogantist Manifesto* (ゴーマニズム宣言, Gōmanizumu sengen,)[12] in 1992, a manga series that would attempt to do what Kobayashi believed few newspapers or magazines had dared to do before – speak straight about topical issues in Japan. The series, originally published in serial form in *Spa! Magazine*, then moving to the more conservative *SAPIO magazine* as Kobayashi's project became stronger in its conservative edge, began with Kobayashi calling the people of Japan to screw their courage to the bone (勇気を持って, Yūki wo motte), and abandon their humble and polite ways to embrace a new age of Japanese arrogance with him at the forefront – the uber-arrogantist. He entreats them to shout out 「ごうまんかましてよかですか！」(Gōmankamashite Yoka desuka?!, roughly translated, "You mind if I give you a piece of my mind?[13]) – a call that would act as the refrain in all

[12] The title is a play on the title of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels' work *The Communist Manifesto*.
[13] Here, I have translated "Gōman kamashite" as "speak one's mind," though literally it means to verbally "spew out" one's arrogance. The term "kamasu" proves difficult to translate into English in this context as

issues to follow - and shake off the shackles of humility that restricted all members of Japanese society from saying what they truly thought. From here he goes on to deal with a variety of issues spanning the cover up scandal around the use of HIV tainted blood in treating hemophiliac patients to the decay of moral values in the young in Japan to the decline in the state of Japanese pop music, always with the image of himself in the pages of the manga acting as narrator, critic, and sometimes participant in the action throughout the series.

Over the next few years following the publication of the first issue of *The Arrogantist Manifesto*, readers would begin to note a change in tone of Kobayashi's writing, a change that some saw as the sign of his downward spiral into neo-nationalism. Uesugi Satoshi, one of Kobayashi's harshest critics on the issue of his denial of the legitimacy of claims made by the comfort women on the Japanese government for restitution, describes this change in the opening pages of his work *The Post-Arrogantist Manifesto* (*脱ゴーマニズム宣言, Datsu Gōmanizumu Sengen).*

> That said, the Yoshirin[14] of recent times is strange. In place of pictures, he has come to overwhelm his frames with words, and the exquisiteness with which he once used to draw has gradually deteriorated. His gag-style offerings have remarkably diminished in number, his writings have lost

---

it means "to say" while implying that what is said is directed with some degree of violence at the listener. I have used the softer "speak one's mind" with the understanding that it should be read with some sense of irony in the tone. The entire expression of "Gōman kamashite yoka desuka" is underwritten with a sense of irony consequent to juxtaposing the politeness of the grammatical structure "-te yoka desuka" (literally, "Would it be all right if I..." with a slight colloquialization of the form with the replacement of the "ii" – "all right" - of the standard form "-te ii desuka" with the colloquial "yoka" from the Kyūshū dialect to give "-te yoka desuka") against the gruffness of expression implicit to the use of the term "kamasu."

[14] "Yoshirin" is a play on his proper name "Yoshinori" (equivalent to the custom of attaching "kun" to the end of male Japanese names; the practice is done to indicate a familial or close relationship between speakers) and is used as a term of endearment by fans. It is also the name he uses for his manga alter ego who appears mainly as narrator to the *Manifesto* series.

> their humor; meanwhile, where once his frames were stuffed with information, they have now turned shallow and trifling. Worse than anything else, however, his fresh way of stating things that communicated his unique perspective has vanished to be replaced with arguments expressing opinions that seem to be borrowed from someone else. Almost all gone are the days when I would read through his manga and leave the last page with a satisfied grunt.[15]

Akutagawa Literary Prize winner Yū Miri goes so far as to appeal to Kobayashi to return to his earlier self in an editorial commentary in the literary magazine *New Current (Shinchō, 新潮)*.

> I have only to wonder pitiably if the technique used in the *Arrogantist Manifesto* hasn't lost its effectiveness. Moreover, though it may be too meddling of me to say, I think you had better take care, because your illustrations are beginning to resemble the war time propaganda distributed by the Chinese people that illustrated the atrocities committed by the Japanese military. And one more thing, I recommend that you quit the Society for History Textbook Reform as soon as possible; the notions "Kobayashi Yoshinori" and "Society for" just don't seem to match.[16]

Here, Yū implies what most critics would come to agree to be the source of Kobayashi's change of heart: the strong influence on him from members of the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform, an organization he joined in 1997. This society has its origins

---

[15] Uesugi Satoshi 上杉聰. Datsu Gōmanizumu Sengen; Kobayashi Yoshinori no "Ianfu" Mondai 脱ゴーマニズム宣言；小林よしのりの「慰安婦」問題 (The Post-Arrogantist Manifesto; Kobayashi Yoshinori and the Comfort Women Issue) (Osaka : Tōhō Publishing 東方出版,1997) 13.
[16] As quoted in Uesugi, *Post-Arrogantist Manifesto*, 13.

in an earlier organization called the Liberal Historiography Research Group (自由主義研究会、Jiyūshugi Kenkyūkai). This research group consists of academics and intellectuals who came together in 1996 to oppose a 1994 court ruling freeing primary and secondary school textbooks from restrictions that originally forbid them to mention the existence of the comfort woman or the human experiments performed by unit 731[17] during the war. The research group protested this change in textbook selection policy by the government under the argument that it feared these negative portrayals of the Japanese military would cultivate a masochistic view (自虐史観、jigyakushikan) of Japanese history in Japan's young. Criticized for labeling itself a "liberal" organization despite its support of conservative ideals, the Research Group, in 1997, branched out to form another organization consisting of most of the same members with the inclusion of other well-known Japanese professors, artists, and politicians, not the least of which was Kobayashi Yoshinori. This organization was named the Society for History Textbook Reform. Taking their cue from the Liberal Historiography Research Group's protest against the change in policy towards government restrictions on the content of middle and high school textbooks, the Society's members took a more active stance against the masochistic view of Japanese history by trying to introduce a new history textbook into classrooms around Japan that would foster a positive, nationalistic view of Japanese history. The following is a translation of their mandate made available on their website:

> We, the members of this society, are determined to revise the teaching of Japanese history on a fundamental level by creating a New History

[17] For an account of the issues and details surrounding the forced coercion of comfort women into prostitution by the Japanese government during the Second World War, see Yoshiaki Yoshimi's *The Comfort Women,* trans. Suzanne O'Brien (Columbia University Press, 2002). For accounts of the human experiments performed by the Japanese military during WWII at Unit 731 and other Japanese war crimes, see Yuki Tanaka's *Hidden Horrors: Japanese War Crimes in World War II,* (Westview Press, 1998).

> Textbook to be used by the children of the 21st Century. Like all countries, Japan has its own particular history to tell… The European and American powers tried to swallow up East Asia during the colonial period. Japan, looking to revive its native traditions, sought out a means to exist harmoniously with western civilization. Japan strove to establish itself as a modern state and maintain its independence as such. However, Japan also has a history of tension and friction with the West. We owe the safety and prosperity of Japan in the world today to the efforts our fathers and forefathers made to establish this Japanese state. However, in post-war history classrooms, the Japanese are learning to forget the traditions and cultural heritage that should have been our inheritance. Japanese pride is being made to vanish. Since the end of the Cold War a masochistic trend in education has been gaining strength, and in today's history textbooks the propaganda of our past enemies has been turned into our assumed "facts" of today. There is no country in the world that would tolerate such a version of its own history…[18]

In keeping with this mandate, Kobayashi published the first volume of a three part special series within the *Arrogantist Manifesto* series entitled *On War (戦争論, Sensō ron*) in 1998, which provided a history of Japan's involvement in WWII that stayed in line with the Society's views. As Marilyn Ivy points out "[the timing of the release of *On War* coinciding with Kobayashi's involvement as "honorary director" of the Society] is

---

[18] 新しい歴史教科書をつくる会 (Atarashii Rekishi Kyōkasho Tsukuru Kai, The Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform). *主張 (Shuchō, Statement of Purpose)* [online]. Available at <http://www.tsukurukai.com/02_about_us/01_opinion.html>

no accident, to be sure, for *Sensōron* already lays out, not without care and not without research, the structure of the restorationist end of masochism and the legitimation of the shared monstrosity that the society endorses."[19]

The first volume, much to Kobayashi's and the Society's welcome surprise, became an overnight success selling "420,000 copies in its first three months of publication, [going] through twenty-nine printings in its first year, and has sold roughly a million copies in total."[20] The three volume series itself would go on to sell over 1.5 million copies, a surprising number considering the high cost of each volume (1500 yen plus tax; compared to the usual 400-600 yen price of manga volumes of similar size[21]). In contrast to its financial success, Kobayashi's *On War* also became the target of a flurry of criticisms from journalist, scholars, and politicians alike. Academic journals in Japan such as *Ronza* (論座, The Seat of Debate) and *People and Education* (人間と教育、Ningen to Kyōiku) devoted entire volumes to criticisms of Kobayashi's work. Ōtsuki Publishers put out a volume of four essays criticizing the work from historical and philosophical perspectives under the title *Are you Willing to Die for Your Country?*

---

[19] Ivy, Marilyn. "Revenge and Recapitation in Recessionary Japan," *The South Atlantic Quarterly* (99.4) 2000. 823.

[20] Clifford, Rebecca, "Cleansing History, Cleansing Japan: Kobayashi Yoshinori's Analects of War and Japan's Revisionist Revival," *Nissan Occasional Paper Series*, no. 35 (Nissan Institute of Japanese Studies: Oxford University). Available at the Nissan Institute's World Wide Web site at http://www.nissan.ox.ac.uk 2.

[21] "Prices of manga are also extraordinarily low, even given the dollar's gutted value versus the yen in late 1995. Where a typical 32-page U.S. comic book (with many ads) cost over $2, a 400-page manga magazine rarely cost more than $3-4." From Schodt's *Dreamland Japan*, 23. A look at manga prices in 2005 show little change in this trend. The average price for a 400-page manga from distributors like Shō-nen Jump or Korokoro Komikusu ranges between 400 to 450 yen.

Criticisms of Kobayashi Yoshinori's On War.[22] Throughout the volume the reader is taken through careful criticisms of Kobayashi's faults in logic and his misrepresentations of historical events. On the other side of the debate, Kobayashi received mountains upon mountains of fan mail. Readers from the ages of ten to eighty years of age loaded his mailroom with letters of support. Kobayashi had hit a note with a large segment of the population, and being the uber-arrogantist, he wasn't afraid to flaunt it. In subsequent editions of his *Arrogantist Manifesto* series he took surveys of reader's thoughts on the state of Japanese nationalism, published letters of support and countered his critics.[23] Regardless of whether readers loved or hated *On War*, one thing was certain, Kobayashi's voice had been heard.

As for the content of *On War*, Kobayashi makes his aims in the volume clear from the first few pages. He begins with depictions of Japanese society in a spiraling tailspin of moral decay: young girls prostitute themselves for money, families fall apart while middle school children go on mad stabbing rampages. Who or what is the cause of this moral decay? Kobayashi finds his answer in the importation of radical individualism that was a consequence of Japan's colonization by the U.S. in the post war period. And what is the solution to overturning the negative effects of this overwhelming U.S. influence? Nothing less than a renewal of the Japanese spirit. Kobayashi hearkens back to wartime Japan, to a better time when his forefathers were ready and willing to sacrifice everything to protect the Japanese homeland, when the Japanese warrior didn't prostate himself in

---

[22] Kobayashi Yoshinori 小林よしのり. *Kimitachi Sensō de Shineruka; Kobayashi Yoshinori Sensōron Hihan* 君たち戦争で死ねるか；小林よしのり『戦争論』批判 *(Are You Willing to Die for Your Country? Criticisms of Kobayashi Yoshinori's* On War*).* (Tokyo : Ōtsuki Booksellers 大月書店, 1999).

[23] Kobayashi Yoshinori 小林よしのり. Shin Gōmanizumu Sengen 6 新ゴーマニズム宣言 6 (The New Arrogantist Manifesto 6). (Tokyo : Gentōsha 幻冬舎, 2001).

the face of Western aggression as he did now. Japan's forefathers were willing to fight to the last man (玉砕、Gyokusai) in order to preserve their way of life. As for the atrocities resulting from Japan's 15 year war - the massacres at Nanjing, the systematic rape of the comfort women all over East Asia, the horrors of human experimentation that took place in Unit 731 - Kobayashi declares these were all lies consequent to a grand conspiracy fabricated by the Western powers to keep Japan in a submissive self-hating state; a conspiracy that had pervaded Japanese society so deeply it had found its legitimation in the work of anti-patriotic Japanese left wing liberals[24] who seemed more interested in appeasing the West than they were in preserving their own sense of national pride.

This success, however, wouldn't stop here for the uber-arrogantist. Two years later, Kobayashi would turn his national fame to international notoriety with the publication of *On Taiwan (台湾論, Taiwanron)*, another special edition to his *Arrogantist Manifesto*. This time he would use Japan's ex-colony Taiwan as example of a country embodying the true character of the Japanese spirit. In this volume, he would begin with the somewhat confounding nationalist statement "The existence of myself – who am I? This is the question that every modern person has to face. We have to answer to the question whether national belonging and national identity still exist! The Japanese should

---

[24] More details on Kobayashi's use of the term "left wing" are given in the notes on page 74. Kobayashi's description of left-wing liberalism in this case is somewhat confusing as he seems to lump Marxists, liberals, feminists, human rights activists, and anti-war activists together under the same category. A look back on historical usages of the term "liberal" in Japan shows that his mistake in equating liberalism with Marxism is not one limited to his own usage, but has roots back to its use in pre-war Japan. Hasegawa Nyozekan 長谷川如是閑, liberal critic and anti-fascist proponent in the years leading up to and during WWII, comments: "Japanese really did not understand well the difference between liberalism and Marxism… They could not see that liberalism was opposed to Marxism." Quoted in Mary L. Hanneman's "Dissent form Within; Hasegawa Nyozekan, Liberal Critic of Fascism," Monumenta Nipponica Vol. 52, No. 1, (1997) 44. Liberalism in Japan was and is still considered (by nationalists, at any rate) a foreign import, its principles adopted from Europe during Japan's rapid westernization in the years of the Meiji Revolution. Thus, anti-liberalism is historically linked to nationalist discourses, though originally liberal ideas had been hailed by people like Fukuzawa Yukichi 福沢諭吉 as an ideological means of strengthening the nation. Ibid.

have the courage to face themselves! Let's take a good look at Taiwan!"[25] The response in Taiwan to his praise of the former colony of Japan for maintaining traditional Japanese values was less than welcoming. Fiery protests broke out forcing the Taiwanese government to declare Kobayashi Yoshinori persona non grata and place a temporary ban on his entering the country for fear of the riots that his visit would incite.[26]

The controversy around the publication of *On Taiwan* in Taiwan would not only spread his influence and reputation over East Asia, but it would also carry his name and reputation out across the Pacific as articles on the protests and calls for boycotts of the manga appeared in news editions distributed by CBS news, and CNN. [27] The furor over *On Taiwan* even inspired Howard French of the New York Times to publish a special piece on Kobayashi Yoshinori titled "Japan's Resurgent Far Right Tinkers With History."[28]

With this newfound national fame and international notoriety, Kobayashi Yoshinori became the poster boy for the Society of History Textbook Reform. He would be invited to sit on panels at conferences in Osaka and Tokyo with other well-known members such as historian, Nishibe Susumu西部邁, and society founder, Fujioka

---

[25] Translation taken from Joyce Liu's paper "Do You Want to Cleanse Your Heart and Change an Identity? Immanentism and the Psyche Politics in Colonial Taiwan," (presented at the Conference on "The Question of Asia in the New Global Order," Asia/Pacific Studies Institute, Duke University, Oct. 1-2, 2004). Article is available online in PDF form at <www.duke.edu/APSI/pdf/asiaconf/JoyceLiu.pdf>. 5.

[26] "Earlier this month, controversial Japanese cartoonist Yoshinori Kobayashi was declared persona non grata by Taiwan and barred entry into the island because his non-fiction comic book quoted an adviser to President Chen Shui-bian as saying Taiwanese women who served as sex slaves for the Japanese army had volunteered their services." *CBS News* [Online], Tokyo, March 21st, 2001. Article available at <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2001/03/26/world/main281672.shtml>

[27] See previous note for coverage by CBS News. CNN News covered the protests in Taiwan in the article "Taiwan boycotts Japanese comic," *CNN News* [online], Feb. 23rd, 2001. Available at <http://edition.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/asiapcf/east/02/23/taiwan.comic.01/>.

[28] French, Howard L. "Japan's Resurgent Far right Tinkers with History," *New York Times, Late Edition (East Coast),* Mar 25, 2001. 1.3

Nobukatsu 藤岡信勝. The society would even go so far as to organize a symposium focused strictly on the impact of Kobayashi's work *On War* in Japan.[29]

With the stage now being set by Kobayashi's confrontation with the international media and public, the Society for History Textbook Reform expanded its activities beyond organizing conferences and symposia to strike while the iron was hot. A year following the uproar caused by the publication of Kobayashi's *On Taiwan*, the Society put forth its contribution to the education of Japan's youth: a textbook published according to its nationalist views on Japanese history to be used in junior high schools. It was named simply *The New History Textbook* (新しい歴史教科書、*Atarashii Rekishi Kyōkasho*). Sure enough Kobayashi's name was listed as one of the contributors.

If the publication of *On Taiwan* caused enough of a stir to place Kobayashi on the international map, then the international turmoil resulting from the publication of *The New History Textbook* was enough to solidify his own place in the annals of Japanese history. The publication of the textbook itself, however, wouldn't be the main cause of the cries of protests that rang out from all over East Asia.[30] In Japan, for a textbook to reach the classroom, it must go through a strict screening process by the Japanese government before it can be authorized for use. Despite the omission of any mention of either Unit 731 or the comfort women in the *New History Textbook*, and despite the description of the Nanjing massacre as an "incident" whose details were still "under

---

[29] 新しい歴史教科書を作る会・第５回シンポジウム；現代日本の『戦争と平和』観への異議申し立てー小林よしのり『戦争論』をめぐってー (The Japanese Society For History Textbook Reform's 5th Symposium on The View of "War and Peace" in Today's Japan; Issues Surrounding Kobayashi Yoshinori's *On War*). September 20th, 1998. Shinjuku Welfare Pension Hall.

[30] "Foreign cities where the protest rallies took place include 37 in Asia, 38 in the Americas, 10 in Africa, 32 in Europe and eight in Oceania." From the article "Protests Staged in 71 Countries Over Textbook," The Korea Times, June 13, 1998. Taken from *the International Movement Against all Forms of Discrimination and Racism* (IMAFDR) Website at <http://www.imadr.org/attention/news2001.1-2.html>

investigation," the Japanese government gave the authorization for the text to be used in middle school classrooms. What ensued was an international battle over the representation of history that would last years, and would eventually result in the souring of relations between China and Japan to its lowest point since the normalizing of international relations in 1972.

Protests

To be honest, I have spent the last few weeks wondering, as I imagine a good number of graduate students must do at some time or another while working on their thesis, if in fact a study of Kobayashi's work would still be relevant to current political, theoretical, and even economic trends in the field of Japanese studies or otherwise. I had begun to wonder if he wasn't merely a temporary fixture on an ever-changing landscape, or merely a symptom of some deeper Japanese malaise that would manifest itself elsewhere once his fifteen minutes in the spotlight had gone by. Granted, he had managed to stir trouble on a national and international scale. Granted, his sphere of production had continued to expand since the publication of the controversial middle school textbook. He went on to publish a monthly magazine, several books on topical Japanese issues with fellow Society Chairman Nishibe Susumu, and a few more instalments in his ongoing *New Arrogantist Manifesto* manga series. Since 2001, however, his presence in the media's eye seems to have faded into the background of Japanese popular culture as the media's attention was drawn away from the textbook controversy to other more immediate concerns like then Foreign Minister Makiko Tanaka's forced resignation over accusations of her fraudulent allocation of funds, or the Japanese Pension Fund scandal which resulted in the forced resignation of the leader of the opposition party, or the continuing controversy over the push by the Koizumi administration to rewrite the Japanese constitution to allow Japan to maintain a fully functional military. On the international stage, all stories were pushed aside by coverage of the September 11th attacks on the World Trade Centre. Then there was the War in Afghanistan, and the War in Iraq that led to the ongoing drama of the War on Terror and

the deterioration of relations between North Korea, the U.S., and Japan. By the end of 2001, Kobayashi seemed to have faded back to his rightful place as one mere passing blip of neo-fascism within an otherwise multi-faceted political arena. Or so I thought.

A few days ago I flipped open my laptop and logged on to the internet for the purposes of doing a long overdue search on thesis-related news stories when I discovered my assumption of Kobayashi's weakening influence in Japanese foreign affairs had quite abruptly been proven wrong. Over the weekend tens of thousands of protesters, I learned, had gathered in Shanghai, Beijing, Shenzhen, Zhuhai, Dongguan, Fujan, Hong Kong, and several other cities in China and the surrounding countries to demonstrate against, amongst other things, the recent authorization by the Japanese government of the newest edition of the *New History Textbook* Kobayashi had been key in developing.[31] The weekend protests, I further learned, were only a continuation of what had been several weeks worth of protests. In a matter of a couple weeks, Kobayashi's influence in Japanese politics had gone from relative inconsequentiality to earth trembling significance. Though most protests were peaceful marches, in places like Shanghai and Beijing the demonstrations were said to be "the most violent" in decades. As one reporter in Shanghai at the time reported[32]:

---

[31] As mentioned earlier, the Japanese government authorizes textbooks on a four-year cycle. The original edition of the textbook was authorized for use in 2001. The second edition was authorized in April of 2005.

[32] Because the protests happened recently I have had to rely solely on news reports for my information. I have done so with skepticism. The coverage of the protests in China offered its own bias as news agencies took sides in their depiction of who was the victim and who was the aggressor in the international exchange of aggressions. This seems evident in the reporting of Howard French from the New York Times (see "China Allows More Protests in Shanghai Against Japan" New York Times [online]. April 17th, 2005. <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/04/17/ international/asia/17china.html?ex=1114920000& en=3fbc97509cd7fc3f&ei=5070>), and most articles out of CNN News department which placed sympathy in favor of Japan as innocent victim (compare the articles "What Chinese Textbooks Don't Say" (April 17th, 2005) versus "Japanese Textbook Rarely Used" (April 14th, 2005) found on CNN News [online] at <http://edition.cnn.com/2005 /WORLD/asiapcf/04/14/japan .textbook.ap/>). In order to combat some of

> On Hushanguan road, a mob threw a bicycle through the windows of a Japanese okonomiyaki restaurant. In a nearby shopping district, protesters broke windows at about 10 Japanese-style noodle shops and bars - many of them Chinese-owned. Several Japanese-made cars were pelted with bottles and gravel, regardless of the nationality of the drivers.[33]

In the same article one bystander gives a description of the beating of two Japanese nationals which occurred during the protests: "I saw hundreds of people kicking and beating the two men. Police tried to intervene, but they couldn't get through the crowd. Everyone said they had been killed." [34] Elsewhere in Shanghai, demonstrators smashed the windows of the Japanese Embassy. Meanwhile in Beijing, "protesters tossed ink bottles, at least 50 eggs and plastic drink bottles at the consulate."[35] In Shenzen a mass of ten thousand protesters surrounded a Japanese supermarket and shouted for boycotts on Japanese imports. Throughout China, anti-Japanese sentiment was fused with Chinese nationalism over two days of protesting as groups of demonstrators sang the Chinese national anthem, chanted slogans like "I love my China within me."[36] Meanwhile the crowds were peppered with images of Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi splashed in blood, and banners touting the words "Japanese pigs out"[37] and "Be Vicious to the Japanese Devils"[38] written in bold.

---

the warp of these perceptions I have tried to construct my description of the protests from a variety of sources.

[33] Watts, Jonathan. 2005. "Violence Flares as The Chinese Rage At Japan," *The Observer* [online]. April 17th. <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/international/story/0,,1461648,00.html>

[34] Ibid.

[35] "Anti-Japan rallies spread to Shenyang, Shenzen." The Asahi Shimbun [online]. April 18th, 2005. <http://www.asahi.com/english/Herald-asahi/TKY200504180104.html>

[36] Ibid.

[37] McNeill, David. 2005. "Chinese Rebuff Japan's Attempts to Ease Tension." The Independent Online Edition. April 18th. <http://news.independent.co.uk/world/asia /story.jsp?story=630524>

On the political front, relations between the Japanese and Chinese government hit their lowest mark since both governments normalized relations in 1972. Linda Jakobson, senior researcher at the Finnish Institute of International Affairs noted, "Unlike past rows, this is not just a passing phenomenon. There has always been a rabid anti-Japanese minority in China, but such views have now spread to moderates and people who would usually consider themselves non-political. It is hot now to be anti-Japanese. In the long run, Japan-China relations will be a major source of worry for East Asia."[39]

Prime Minister Koizumi tried to defuse the controversy by giving a public apology and acknowledgment of war crimes committed in WWII by Japan at the Asia-Africa conference in Jakarta on April 22nd, stating "In the past, Japan through its colonial rule and aggression caused tremendous damage and suffering to the people of many countries, particularly to those of Asian nations. Japan squarely faces these facts of history in a spirit of humility and with feelings of deep remorse and heartfelt apology always engraved in mind."[40] This message, however, was received with mixed feelings by Japan's neighbours as it followed close on the heels of a pilgrimage of over 50 lawmakers, including Hiranuma Takeo 平沼赳夫, a former trade minister, and Watanuki Tamisuke 綿貫民輔, a former speaker of the lower house, as well as 119 other government aides to Yasukuni Shrine[41] on the same day of Koizumi's public apology.

---

[38] "Japan anger at Shanghai Violence." BBC News [online]. April 16th, 2005. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/4452097.stm>

[39] From Watts, "Violence Flares...," *The Observer*.

[40] "Japanese PM apologizes for war." CNN News. April 22nd, 2005. http://edition.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/asiapcf/04/22/china.japan.koizumi/index.html

[41] Official and unofficial visits to Yasukuni Shrine by government authorities (including several Prime Ministers such as Koizumi himself) have incited controversy between Japan and its neighbors on several occasions. Yasukuni Shrine is a war shrine dedicated to the worship of fallen Japanese soldiers as Gods. Included amongst those worshipped are Class A War Criminals such as Tōjō Hideki.

Meanwhile, in Japan, Chinese nationals felt the sting of retribution from Japanese seeking revenge for the violence done in China on April 16th and 17th. According to an article in the *Guardian Unlimited*, on the week following the protests in China

> a man was arrested for throwing a Molotov cocktail at the Yokohama branch of the Bank of China [in Japan]. In the past few days there have been reports of intimidation of restaurateurs and their customers by members of the organized far right. Elsewhere in Japan, police have reported a spate of attacks against Chinese interests in the past two weeks. More than 20 Chinese business or diplomatic missions around Japan have been attacked in what are being described as politically inspired "hate crimes"... Shots were fired at a dormitory for Chinese students of a language school in Tokyo, although no injuries were reported. In Osaka, a man set himself alight after throwing a bottle at the Chinese consulate, apparently prompted by anger at the recent anti-Japanese demonstrations. The consulate also received an envelope containing a spent cartridge and a note threatening to harm Chinese students living in Japan.[42]

The Japanese government's ambiguous reaction to the racial violence against Chinese nationals found its most confounding voice in a double-edged public statement made by Education Minister, Nakayama Nariaki 中山成彬, who "labeled [the violent acts] '*un-Japanese*' and 'shameful,'"[43] thus managing to condemn the aggressive acts while at the same time reinforcing the nationalist logic that made them possible.

---

[42] McCurry, Justin. 2005. "Textbook Crimes." *The Guardian Unlimited* [online]. April 22nd. http://www.guardian.co.uk/china/story/0,7369,1466674,00.html> *Emphasis is mine.*
[43] Ibid.

Essentialist national sentiments like the one expressed in Nakayama's statement, and the ones given expression in the protests in China with the singing of the national anthem and the brutalization of the two Japanese nationals seems to find easy circulation throughout the controversy over the *New History Textbook* and Kobayashi's work. Faced with the near-absurdity of the contradictions and double standards fuelling this tit-for-tat circulation of indignation, one becomes mystified as to how Kobayashi's and the Society for History Textbook Reform's project to revitalize national pride could have given rise to protests in China that depended on these same nationalist sentiments for mobilization, and consequently served to fortify the very Japanese nationalist feelings that set the controversy in motion. How was it possible for this cyclical logic to flow so easily between the two countries without any acknowledgment on either side of their mutual implication in ensuring the continuation of racialized violence? More importantly, was this a cycle that could be escaped? Did these protests and their consequences indicate an inherent characteristic of criticism to enclose itself within a system that trapped both critic and object of criticism in a stable binary of cyclical confrontation? Or were other factors involved in the circulation that needed to be acknowledged before an escape route could be charted?

Though I will not be dealing with this question as it concerns the protests in China, I think these are key questions to be faced when dealing with texts as controversial and contentious as the works written by Kobayashi Yoshinori on Japan's war past. In the following pages I will be looking at how this cycle of confrontation has been sustained in some aspects of the critical work done on Kobayashi. This analysis of criticisms will then lead me into a development of what I call the *sim-pathetic tactic*, a tool I will use to

bridge the gap separating the notion of Kobayashi as nationalist or neo-fascist from Kobayashi as an individual moved by a complex of motivations.

Section II
Critique: The Sim-pathetic Tactic

A Move Away from Strategic Criticism

In the above summary I have taken the "standard" point of view in describing Kobayashi's work. I have suggested that he is a Japanese neo-nationalist, and neo-fascist. I have subordinated his individual voice to the institutional voice of the Society for History Textbook Reform. I have suggested the presence of a turn in the tone of his work from light-hearted parody to conservative political commentary, and I have focused on his most controversial opinions, while overlooking some of the more detailed arguments he uses to establish the legitimacy of these arguments. Though I have tried to provide as full a description of his work as is possible in the page limits within which I am working, I have tainted my description of his work to reveal Kobayashi within a particular light. I have done this for the purpose of providing the reader with a *sense* of the Kobayashi that is encountered in nearly all criticisms of his work.

If I were dealing with a different topic of study I would assume that there was a generally accepted understanding that whatever critical construction of the figure in question was being made was necessarily contingent to whatever constraints were imposed by the author of the text. In the case of Kobayashi Yoshinori, this, unfortunately, does not seem to be the case. The Kobayashi encountered in criticisms is rarely more than two-dimensional. He rarely speaks with an individual voice, and his arguments are rarely analyzed with reference to the greater context of the project he has established within the *Arrogantist Manifesto*. In sum, Kobayashi's work is more often than not treated as though it were uniformly determined. Instead of his work providing the ground

upon which he founds his neo-nationalist inclinations, critics tend to inverse this relationship, making his nationalism the uniform ground upon which his work gains meaning.

The reasons for this general disregard for the complexity of his work could be attributed to many things. First, he is a manga writer, and, until recently (thanks to the work of people like Sharon Kinsella with *Adult Manga*, and Susan Napier working in the associated area of Japanese anime[44]), academic work on manga was seen as irrelevant or plebeian. Secondly, his association with the Society for History Textbook Reform has come to overshadow his work, so that the Society's aims and objectives are taken to be equivalent to his own. As a consequence most work mentioning his texts inevitably refer the reader back to a history of the Society and its members rather than looking at his writing within the context of his past work. Third, and most important of all, dealing with Kobayashi's work, because it deals with such delicate and emotionally charged topics, inevitably brings with it political implications for the person writing on him. Kobayashi's status in Japan could be likened to that of the neo-nazi Holocaust deniers in Europe (an assertion that I do not think is at all far fetched). Thus, there is a fear that any ground given to him in his arguments will be co-opted by the nationalist movement in Japan to prove to the public the legitimacy of their position. Regardless of this fear, or perhaps because of it, I feel there must be some ink spent on trying to deepen our understanding of his work, not as homogeneous voice of nationalism, but as the more complicated voice of an individual moved by a variety of influences.

---

[44] Napier, Susan. *Anime from Akira to Princess Mononoke; Experiencing Contemporary Japanese Animation*, (New York : Palgrave, 2001).

With this in mind, I plan to abandon an aggressive confrontational approach to analyzing Kobayashi's texts since this approach more often than not, as seen with the protests in China, seems to ensure the circulation of the very logic of power that seems to have made the writing of his texts possible. Though I admit the importance in keeping an account of the workings of power throughout my analysis, and I don't deny its relevance in mobilizing resistance against the various racisms, fascisms, and genocidal ideologies that exist in works like Kobayashi's, I would like to take a different *tactic* in approaching Kobayashi's work, if for no other reason, than to provide an alternate reading to his work.

My tactics in dealing with Kobayashi's work are based on a particular belief that a criticism of "dangerous texts" that aims at distancing and objectifying the subject of criticism from my own realm of subjective production does little to recognize or deal with the *logic of sense* running as undercurrent to the work being analyzed, while also giving rise to a kind of blindness that reduces the possibility of recognizing my implication in the production of this logic. Though, to a degree, I understand the necessity of villainizing tyrants, dictators, and fascists for the purpose of maintaining a conscious record of the danger and destruction their systems of thinking have given rise to in the past, I'm not sure how much is accomplished in treating men like Kobayashi, or Adolph Hitler, Tōjō Hideki, Stalin or even George W. Bush, as aberrations of "humanity." As much as I disagree with Kobayashi's project, I feel I must respect the fact that he came to his way of thinking for what he believed to be legitimate reasons. By admitting this, and exploring the implications of this admission, I hope to offer the possibility of approaching his texts critically without losing sight of the fact that criticism

involves a multi-vectored movement that produces the critic, the object of criticism, as well as the criticism itself.

I will be taking what I will call a "tactical" approach, as opposed to a "strategic" one, to Kobayashi's works in the following pages. I will go into more detail about the particulars of this method of approach in sections to follow, but before I do I think it is important I explain how I will be distinguishing between the uses of the terms "tactic" and "strategy." I take *parts* of my understanding of the distinction between a tactic and strategy from Michel de Certeau's *The Practice of Everyday Life*:

> I call a "strategy" the calculus of force-relationships which becomes possible when a subject of will and power (a proprietor, an enterprise, a city, a scientific institution) can be isolated from an "environment." A strategy assumes a place that can be circumscribed as *proper (propre; italics not mine)* and thus serve as the basis for generating relations with an exterior distinct from it (competitors, adversaries, "clienteles," "targets," or "objects" of research). Political, economic, and scientific rationality has been constructed on this strategic model.
>
> I call a "tactic" a calculus which cannot count on a "proper" (a spatial or institutional localization), nor thus on a borderline distinguishing the other as a visible totality. The place of a tactic belongs to the other. A tactic insinuates itself into the other's place, fragmentarily, *without taking it over in its entirety, without being able to keep it at a distance.* (*italics mine*) It has at its disposal no base where it can capitalize on its

> advantages, prepare its expansions, and secure independence with respect to circumstances. [45]

At some level, I have to admit that my approach must inevitably take on the characteristics of de Certeau's notion of "strategy" – this is an academic paper written according to certain base assumptions about the context within which it will be read grounding my understanding of the dilemmas involved and how I will approach them. I do not intend to call my approach a tactic in the sense that I have somehow managed to release myself from the institutional constraints and privileges that have made the writing of this paper possible. In calling my approach a tactic in opposition to the strategic approaches of the criticisms I will delineate below, I mean to emphasize a partial/virtual collapse of distance separating myself from my object of study. In opposition to this, I mean to write a strategy as a particular way of writing about the object of study that assumes the object's place is fixed in accordance with the manner in which it or he is spoken about. That is to say, a strategy takes an externalized position from the object of study and reads its occupied area of existence as uniform and fixed in order to give weight to the opposing position taken by the person criticizing the object of study. On the other hand, a tactic, for my purposes, allows for the contingent abandonment of this oppositional stance to explore some of the possible intricacies within the subject's argumentation that may have gone overlooked in the confrontational approach. I feel I have had to make this distinction between a strategy and tactic in this paper in particular, because of the material I will be dealing with. Though I understand that in most cases it goes as understood that the object of study has necessarily been constituted or fabricated

---

[45] de Certeau, Michel, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven F. Rendall (University of California Press, 1984) xix.

in some ways by the person writing and so the strategies taken are meant to be contingent to the position taken by the writer, in the particular case of Kobayashi Yoshinori, I get no indication that this is the assumption being made with regard to his position in Japanese studies, since, as I have mentioned above, the majority of criticisms written against his work treat it in a uniform manner.[46]

With this in mind, instead of addressing Kobayashi's work from the externalized, confrontational perspective of a "strategic" approach, I intend to read him using what I call the *sim-pathetic tactic*.[47] In taking a *sim-pathetic* tactical approach, I will need to "insinuate myself" (at least partly) into Kobayashi's place in order to explore some of the intricacies of his work that seem to go overlooked by critics that see him and his work as uniformly motivated by national interests. In doing so, I may be perceived as a supporter or apologist of his ideas. I reiterate, this is not my intention. Though my analysis will be a *sim-pathetic* one, it is not meant to be a *sympathetic* one.[48] That is to say, even while I assume a position that invokes a simulated partial collapse of the critical distance separating myself from Kobayashi's work, this collapse is only a simulation, but a simulation that keeps open the possibility of encountering the constantly shifting multiplicity of a partialized subject (or sbjeuct[49]), and not the closed, fixed nominalization of an object written as permanently inaccessible.

---

[46] I will go into more detail on this in the following chapter, "Critique of Criticisms."

[47] This is not to say that strategic approaches are not themselves valuable tools for criticism. A strategic approach is essential for defining the ground upon which a confrontation occurs. Without the strategic approaches taken by Kobayashi's critics this paper would not have been possible. These criticisms are necessary in providing characterizations of Kobayashi's work that mark his texts as possibly troubling or dangerous, while offering the public counter histories, logics, etc. that show his version of "truth" or "history" is not the only one available. Strategic approaches as I have characterized them, however, should not be the only tools used, because of their dependence on an externalization of the object encountered. I offer this tactical approach as mere addition to the network of strategies that have already been put in place.

[48] See page 56 for a definition of the term *sim-pathetic*.

[49] I deal with defining the *sjbceut* in the following section.

A Critique of Criticism

Critics call Kobayashi a neo-nationalist, revisionist historian, hawk, conservative, and neo-fascist with the hopes of transforming him into a conceivable homogeneous entity to be manipulated and dismantled. In doing so, however, they fall into the trap of writing themselves as counter identity to this label, while at the same time reinforcing the essentialist notion of identity that they target as one of the founding principles informing Kobayashi's project of neo-nationalism. Critics call Kobayashi's histories partial, biased, illegitimate, and in so doing imply their histories are somehow less partial, less biased, or more legitimate. Critics try to undermine Kobayashi's authority to speak about history, but need to place themselves in a position of authority in order to do so. The critic, by taking these strategic approaches to Kobayashi's work, constantly ends by reinforcing the logical structures he is trying to dismantle. The critic, in assuming that identity – Kobayashi's identity as nationalist, fascist, or war-monger or his own identity as critic, historian, academic, writer, etc. – precedes the discursive structure of his approach, blinds himself to the reinforcing character his criticism has on the logic framing the manifestation of his object of criticism.

Kobayashi is no stranger to irony, and this particular irony is not lost on him. In fact, he feeds off it to reinforce his own position by turning criticisms back on the critics to undermine their position. ""The common disposition of the anti-Kobayashi group involves maintaining the notion that they are right," he writes in an instalment of the *Manifesto* following the outcry visited on him by critics of his work *On War*.

"'Kobayashi is wrong!' [they say.]

"'Kobayashi is a fake.'

"'I am right,' [they declare.]

"'I am more right [than him].'

"'Why are people paying attention to Kobayashi when I am the one who is right?'

"'Haven't I proved the extent of my right-ness?'

"They are nothing but idiots. After all, it's up to the reader to decide. What's more, do they really think this is all about who is right? Amongst intellectuals there are quite of few of these individuals who try to incite trouble by taking the 'I am right so you should listen to me' stance."[50] As this passage shows, Kobayashi is not unaware of the critical arguments available to dismantle positions based on a sense of righteousness. To think that he is unaware as to how these arguments can be used on his own work seems far-fetched considering the hyper-reflexive, ironic mode of expression of which he makes constant use. Thus, the uniformly self-righteous Kobayashi to which critics point is not always the same Kobayashi that his readers encounter.

***

For reasons of space, I will restrict my critique of Kobayashi's critics to dealing with a small representative number. I have tried to include criticisms written in both English and Japanese, though the bulk of criticisms existing on Kobayashi's work weighs well in favour of the latter. I include English works in order to guard against any inadvertent misinterpretation of my analysis along racial lines. Had I selected only Japanese criticisms for my analysis, my comments might have taken on an orientalist flavor simply by virtue of the fact that I am a "western writer" writing on "things Japanese." In all honesty, I do not perceive Kobayashi as representative of a particularly unique Japanese position. Though he is writing in relation to and within a discursive formation organized according to notions of Japanese-ness, I don't see the man himself as

---

[50] Kobayashi, *The New Arrogantist Manifesto 6*, 18.

occupying any particularly distinguishing qualities that make him *essentially* different from anyone else. He is merely *different* and unique in the same way Giorgio Agamben writes difference under the sign of the *quodlibet* or "whatever" of the coming being.

Furthermore, I will need to restrict the limit of my scope to centre around particular works written by Kobayashi Yoshinori. Kobayashi is nothing if not prolific in his writing. Not only does he continue to offer instalment after instalment of his *Arrogantist Manifesto* every month, he has made several television appearances, notably on the late-night program *Raw TV till Morning (Asamade Nama Terebi, 朝まで生テレビ)*, he continually publishes commentaries on his work, he also publishes transcripts of round-table discussions and interviews with intellectuals, politicians, and fellow Society members. Since May of 2002 he has served as creator, editor, and main contributor to his own Magazine, *Wascism(わしズム)*. With all there is written by Kobayashi and about him, there is not enough room to deal with this mass of texts, so I am going to limit the scope of this paper to those issues addressed in the three volume special series to the *New Arrogantist Manifesto*, entitled *On War*. To do this, I will have to include work done in several other supplementary texts, such as the third, and sixth volume of the *New Arrogantist Manifesto*; the third volume first introduces the issue of the comfort women, and is seen by some critics as the first *Manifesto* issue to show strong indication of Kobayashi's turn towards conservativism; the sixth volume, written while the first issue of the *On War* series was receiving nationwide criticism and praise, offers valuable insight into Kobayashi's thoughts on the nationwide reaction to his work. Also, another special instalment to the Manifesto entitled *On Post-Righteousness* provides a useful glimpse into Kobayashi's reasons for "breaking" with the left. In the volume, he charts

his involvement with a left-wing university organization from his original enthusiasm in helping them in their battle against the establishment (in this case the Ministry of Health and Welfare) to his disillusionment when the group is taken over by ideologically driven left wing hardliners, his resistance of this ideological turn, and his eventual ejection from the group.

To familiarize the reader with the main issues dealt with in these volumes, I have provided the following brief summary of Kobayashi's most contentious assertions.

a) The comfort women (従軍慰安婦, jūgun ianfu) were not "forcefully abducted" (強制連行, kyōsei renkō) by the Japanese military into working as prostitutes at various "comfort stations" (慰安所, ianjo) around Asia, but willingly joined the stations out of a need for money.

b) The Nanjing Massacre did not take place, but is a historical fabrication concocted by the Western Powers who desired to write a victor's history of the war and the Chinese government who staged the incident by having its own military commit the alleged atrocities in order to gain the attention and sympathy of the world.

c) The Tokyo War Crimes Trials were another fabrication created by the Western Powers to justify its own righteousness in the war, and Tōjō Hideki, amongst other war criminals, was not in fact a criminal but a war hero.

d) The reason Japan engaged in the Great East Asian War (大東亜戦争, daitasen-sō), a term Kobayashi prefers to the more commonly used "Pacific War" (太平洋戦争, taiheiyō sensō),[51] had nothing to do with a desire to expand its empire.

---

[51] I defer to Obinata Sumio's explanation for the change in terms as given in his summary of Kobayashi's *On War* in "What is 'On War' About?" from the one volume collection of essays entitled *Are You Willing*

Japan engaged in a total war because it wanted to create a stable peace in East Asia by expelling the colonialist powers.

e) The cause of moral decay in Japanese society today is a result of a radical individualism (個性, kosei) that finds its roots in a program to brainwash the Japanese people into believing and desiring a masochistic (自虐, jigyaku) history put in place through the machinations of the "War Guilt Information Program" coordinated by the U.S. occupation forces under General MacArthur's command in the years 1945 to 1952. The left wing, pro-democratic, pro-capitalist faction of Japanese society has continued to ensure the proliferation of this masochist's history in MacArthur's absence.

So as not to foster the illusion that I might be harbouring a belief that his work is somehow cleaner, nobler, or less contradictory than that of his critics, I think it is only fair, at this point, to begin with an example taken from Kobayashi's own texts of the cyclical logic I will argue plagues the works of his critics. As widespread as the "blindness of the binary" is in criticisms of Kobayashi's work, it is never more apparent than in Kobayashi's work itself.

---

to Die for Your Country; Criticisms of Kobayashi Yoshinori's On War. Obinata writes, "The Japanese government (under Tōjō Hideki) determined to call this war the Great East Asian War (大東亜戦争, daitō asensō) immediately following the opening of hostilities (with the U.S.) on December 10th, 1941. On December 12th they justified the war on the grounds that its aims were to 'bring new order to greater East Asia' (大東亜新秩序、daitōashinchitsujo). Thus the term was imbued with the sense that the war was a righteous 'crusade' (聖戦、seisen) aimed at creating a 'Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere' (大東亜共栄圏、daitōakyōeiken) within which Asia would be freed [from colonialism]. Even today, there are those, having grown up during the time when this was the term commonly used, who call it the Great East Asian War by force of habit and without implying any deeper meaning. However, for the most part, the use of this term when deliberately used has come to imply the speaker intends to take a pro-war stance. Also, though the term 'Pacific War' (太平洋戦争、taiheiyōsensō) came to be used following the war through U.S. influence, lately the term 'Asia-Pacific War' (アジア太平洋戦争、ajiataiheiyōsensō) has spread in usage as it indicates the inclusion of the wars that took place in China and East Asia." 14-15

In Kobayashi's denial of Japanese responsibility for the atrocities committed in Nanjing in 1937, he attributes the loss of civilian life to Chinese mendacity. The Chinese were at fault for disguising their military as plain clothes civilians. His face wrinkled in disgust, Yoshirin, Kobayashi's manga alter ego, describes instance after instance of Japanese soldiers graciously passing Chinese civilians by, sometimes even offering them a kind word, only to be shot in the back moments later.[52] In a later volume, Kobayashi proudly champions Japanese civilians for their fight-to-the- last-man-woman-or-child attitude (玉砕, Gyokusai) when the war finally reaches the mainland.[53] Kobayashi staunchly refutes accusations that Japanese soldiers turned their guns on their own people rather than allow their wives and children to be taken prisoner. These women and children were shot mercilessly by soldiers of the Allied Forces as they took up whatever arms became available to them to use in protecting their homeland. In a simple twist of words and context, Kobayashi provides the reader with the mirror image of the Chinese armed civilians of the Nanjing massacre, but radically transformed; instead of couching these civilian fighters in terms of disgust and scorn as he does the Chinese, he lauds them as a proud Japanese people inspired by a patriotic warrior spirit. Kobayashi arms Chinese civilians with machine guns. Their faces are grim with hatred and determination. Japanese civilians attack with sticks and poles, but their expressions are the same. Grim. Determined. The reader is expected to remain blind to these similarities. Nationalist sentiment provides the gap by which this blindness is made possible. They are Chinese; we are Japanese, and the meanings of the two nationalisms are essentially different, in spite of the fact that every other aspect beyond the ambiguous characteristics defining nationalities seems almost exactly the same.

---

[52] 小林よしのり Kobayashi Yoshinori. Shin Gōmanizumu Sengen Special: Sensōron 新ゴーマニズム宣言Special : 戦争論 (New Arrogantist Manifesto Special Edition: On War). (Tokyo : Gentōsha 幻冬舎, 1998). 125-128.

[53] 小林よしのり Kobayashi Yoshinori. Shin Gōmanizumu Sengen Special: Sensōron 2 新ゴーマニズム宣言Special : 戦争論 2 (New Arrogantist Manifesto Special Edition: On War 2). (Tokyo : Gentōsha 幻冬舎, 2003). 121.

The Negation of Life

Arakawa Shōji provides a key criticism of Kobayashi's *On War* in his essay "The Ingenuity of Inviting Readers into a Story that Offers Nothing More Than an Inflexible Vision of the Past"[54] In his conclusion, Arakawa writes, "the thing the author has forgotten, that thing that human beings believe holds the greatest value, is not manifested in the willingness to die for the preservation of state authority, but finds itself in a way of thinking that values a respect for life that has been around since the starting point of modern society." At heart, Kobayashi's work, in its subordination of individual desire to state authority, in its glorification of war, and its aim to purify the Japanese spirit, seems to function according to a negation of life. At the same time that I share Arakawa's sentiments (in fact, I come to the very same conclusion in my analysis of Kobayashi's work) and acknowledge the importance of his remark, I think it is equally important to recognize that most of the criticisms aimed at Kobayashi's work function, to some extent or another, according to a similar logic of negation. One of the most common tactics for undermining Kobayashi's authority and legitimacy in speaking about Japan's past involves a process of labeling. Because Kobayashi's project with the *Arrogantist Manifesto* series is founded on his own conviction that he is a lone, radical voice of independent or "arrogantist" thought urging others to "speak their mind" without adhering to institutional notions of what is right or proper, critics aim to dismantle his supposedly revolutionary project by labeling him a nationalist, conservative, or mouthpiece for the Society for History Textbook Reform. His is not an independent voice of dissent, because he is following a far more sinister and organized agenda.

---

[54] Arakawa Shōji 荒川章二. "Kako no Kyōben ni Suginu 'Monogatari' ni Dokusha wo Sasoikomu Shikake ni Takumisa" 過去の強弁にすぎぬ「物語」に読者を誘い込む仕掛けの巧みさ (The Ingenuity of Inviting Readers into a Story that offers Nothing more than an Inflexible Vision of the Past" from *Ronza: Kobayashi Yoshinori "Sensōron" Hihan* 論座:小林よしのり『戦争論』批判 *(The Seat of Debate: Criticism of Kobayashi Yoshinori's On War)* 44, (December, 1998), 193-197.

Recently, because of his involvement with the Society for History Textbook Reform, Kobayashi is most commonly viewed as a mere mouthpiece for the organization borrowing most of his ideas and arguments from society founder and chairman Fujioka Nobukatsu. Marilyn Ivy, in her work "Revenge and Recapitation in Recessionary Japan," goes so far as to suggest Kobayashi's *On War* was written merely as a vehicle for propagating the society's ideology. She writes:

> In its own fantasy of mass dissemination and reproduction, the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform confesses its desire to create a million seller. Yet it has already been anticipated by the 1998 publication of Sensōron [On War], now in its twenty-second printing. Creator of the gōmanisuto sengen (proclamations of arrogance) [sic] series of manga, in which Sensōron emerges as only the latest and most notorious inflection, the author/artist Kobayashi Yoshinori also serves as "honorary director" of the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform. This is no accident, to be sure, for Sensōron already lays out, not without care and not without research, the structure of the restorationist end of masochism and the legitimation of shared monstrosity that the society endorses.[55]

She reinforces her thesis that Kobayashi functions according to a deferral of his subjective opinion to group intent when turning her focus on a chapter dealing with what Kobayashi believes to be "spurious photographs" (ニセ写真, niseshashin) depicting atrocities committed by the Japanese during the massacre in Nanjing. She treats three photographs to a critical analysis. With her analysis of the third photograph which shows a number of severed heads placed in a row on the ground, presumably heads of the victims of Japanese soldiers, Ivy drives home the theme of her paper: Kobayashi's denial of the legitimacy of all of these photograph's is the symptom of a more

---

[55] Ivy, Marilyn. "Revenge and Recapitation in Recessionary Japan." *The South Atlantic Quarterly 4* (Fall 2000): 823.

widespread feature in Japanese society to yearn after a re-capitation of the national self after its loss consequent to the revelation of monstrosities committed by the Japanese military during the Second World War. Kobayashi's subjectivity is thus doubly deferred, first to the Society, then through the Society to Japanese society in general.

Addressing Kobayashi's denial that these heads were ones severed and put on display by Japanese soldiers, Ivy writes:

> The gaping mouths of the severed heads become the mark of non-Japaneseness, the sign of horror that announces its alienation from proper Japanese murder. Under the sign of execution, and under the pretext of banditry, decapitations are presented as natural. A dismembered Japan can only come back together if the dismemberments, mutilations, and decapitations it has performed are shared ("yes, decapitations are monstrous, but our decapitations are no more heinous than yours or anyone else's"). The heads that roll – that circulate – through space and time become the severed part objects of the enjoyment of war that postwar peace and democracy have denied, leftovers of the Real that refuse to be contained.[56]

Marilyn Ivy goes on to draw comparisons between this representation of decapitation with other repetitions of the same trope in the realm of real events with the decapitation of young boys by the adolescent serial killer Shōnen A, and in the realm of film with the decapitation and recapitation of a god in Miyazaki Hayao's (宮崎駿) immensely popular animated feature, *Princess Mononoke*. After treating each instance of decapitation with a rigorous analysis of its meaning within the context of Japanese society, she concludes her analysis by stitching this trope back together with the neo-nationalist plight to piece back together a broken Japan.

---

[56] ibid 828

> ...one cannot help but think of the neonationalist's compulsion to return to World War II and the exhibitions of atrocity they hope to stop. In *Mononokehime's* topos of revenge become monstrous, we sense a reprisal of those other forms of retribution savoured by neo-nationalists, literalized by Aum's war, and turned inside out by the solitary Shōnen A. That the effects of this revenge would be allegorized in the form of a beheading that resutures itself indicates the power of the fantasy space of animation and the recessionary strength of national-cultural desires to restore what has been lost, here literalized as the severed head of a god. Restored where, then? To its transcendental body-home, the Japanese nation: decapitated, recapitated, and dead certain of its own ghastly return.

Brilliant and perceptive as Ivy's analysis of this trope of decapitation is, there is a subtle and unstated sense running parallel to her argument which functions, at least in part, according to the same logic she criticizes. I cannot help but detect a hint of disparagement in her tone in the manner she addresses the neo-nationalist movement as represented by Kobayashi's work and the work of the Society for History Textbook Reform. The weighted negative value implied in using the label "neo-nationalist" aside, when introducing the neo-nationalists into her text, Ivy characterizes them as "perversely hopeful [in the wake of the downturn of the Japanese economy]...for the restoration of economic, ethical, and national limits."[57] Later on, she describes her consternation when faced with a brochure sent to her from the Society for History Textbook Reform. Her tone thick with irony, she writes, "By the very logic of their nationalist project, the society's appeal to a non-Japanese would seem to be illegitimate. Who are those non-Japanese others who could support this rescue mission? Clearly, American Japanologists comprise one such group of potential others." Her most scathing and

---

[57] ibid 820

effective criticism involves a comparison between the neo-nationalist's "logic of death" and the logic of death that informed the actions of the child serial murderer Shōnen A. Addressing the Society for History Textbook Reform's desire to have the lost and aimless youth of Japan "re-articulated as subjects of an intact nation state in which atrocities no longer figure as such" with the understanding that "they must be willing to die – sacrifice has to be made real – and to kill," Ivy quips, "Would the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform be surprised to think that this logic of death is not without relation to the horrific serialized murders performed by the anonymous Youth A (Shōnen A) of Kobe?"[58]

By writing neo-nationalism under this sign of the pejorative, Ivy inscribes her own recapitation story into the very fabric of her analysis. In this story, the neo-nationalists are the part objects to an unspecified moral whole. This group whose aim is to recapitate Japan by providing a history marked by the erasure of atrocity, to return the Japanese to Japan itself, is her decapitated human representative. They are inherently partial beings. Otherwise, how could they not recognize the irony of their "Japanese neo-nationalist" brochure sent to the "American Japanologist"? She inscribes them with partialness when she likens them to Shōnen A. Shōnen A is a murderer, so how could they not recognize the danger implied by their shared logic, if there wasn't something missing from their field of perception, if there wasn't something inherently partial to their project that blinded them to this murderous likeness? Unlike the neo-nationalists and perhaps to her credit, Ivy does not provide the outline for a project of recapitation. However, by placing herself in the position of "recognizer," by taking up the distanced location whereby she assumes the power and ability to perceive this lack, she assumes the identity of a more totalizing viewer. In the absence of qualifying remarks, the act of recognition implies the creation of a hierarchical relationship between the person

---

[58] ibid 829

who recognizes and the person who is recognized where the person who is recognized assumes the subordinate position.[59] Without admitting the partiality of my own perspective in the act of recognizing Marilyn Ivy's double-folded trope of decapitation, my reader is left with little alternative but to assume my field of vision is wider than hers. I decapitate Ivy in her act of decapitating the neo-nationalists in their act of decapitating Japan… and our heads role through space and time in suspended circulation.

Writing Kobayashi under the label "revisionist," Rebecca Clifford offers a similar circular logic in a different guise. According to Clifford, Kobayashi's revisionism yearns after better days when the Japanese national character was pure and noble. The corruption of this noble spirit results in the decay of modern moral society, a decay that manifests itself in "the current trend towards 'feminization' among young men" which "threaten the patriarchal narrative itself," and "changes to conventional notions of women's sexual identity" whereby "images of the sexualized commodification of women's bodies…suggest the moral degeneration of Japanese society."[60] Clifford describes Kobayashi's tactic in dealing with this degeneration as a turn outward to external sources of blame.

> The root cause of moral corruption and loss of purity in modern Japan, according to Kobayashi, can thus be traced to a distorted foreign concept that the Japanese were tricked into adopting in the aftermath of war and defeat. [61]

---

[59] This is an observation Pierre Bourdieu makes in *The Logic of Practice,* "the place designated in advance as that of the objective and objectifying observer who, like a stage manager playing at will with the possibilities offered by the objectifying instruments in order to bring the object closer or move it further away, to enlarge or reduce it, imposes on the object his own norms of construction, as if in a dream of power." *The Logic of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Stanford, Calif. : Stanford University Press, 1990), 31.

[60] Clifford, Rebecca, "Cleansing History, Cleansing Japan: Kobayashi Yoshinori's Analects of War and Japan's Revisionist Revival," *Nissan Occasional Paper Series*, no. 35 (Nissan Institute of Japanese Studies: Oxford University). Available at the Nissan Institute's World Wide Web site at http://www.nissan.ox.ac.uk 13 - 14

[61] ibid 15

In an interesting reflection of this same movement to defer blame, Clifford writes Kobayashi as mere link in a chain of a revisionist conspiracy to rewrite history. In the paragraph immediately following the passage above, she quickly constructs a chain of names through which Kobayashi's own name slips out from the sign of subjective intent and is dispersed by circulation through a network of conspiratorial interests. "It should be noted here," she writes, "that Kobayashi has borrowed this idea largely from Fujioka, who has argued for years that the 'problems' in Japanese society… are the Americans' fault. This type of accusation serves two useful functions for Fujioka and other members of the Liberal Historiography [Research] Group…" Moving blame from Kobayashi to Fujioka to the Liberal Historiography Research Group (and by already established association, the "revisionists"), Clifford shifts the origin for Kobayashi's ideas out from the governance of an individual subjectivity into the more palatable realm of institutional control. This gives rise to one of the most perplexing double folded comments in the paper: "Ultimately, however, Kobayashi and others like him prefer to regard those who challenge traditional Japanese society as being motivated by forces beyond their control."[62] In much the same way she describes Kobayashi as incapable of fathoming a Japanese origin to the so-called "decay of moral values" in Japan, she seems reluctant to accommodate the possibility that Kobayashi came to his reasoning via a subjectively determined route. Under the sign of conspiracy, his project takes on a more sinister and otherly tone, and assuages "humanity" from the burden of dealing with the possibility of recognizing itself in his singularly determined voice. Instead of heads rolling through space and time, here we have the circulation of blame flying out from the realm of individual responsibility only to return as an unrecognizable foreigner, revisionist. Someone-else.

---

[62] ibid

In a work by Japanese scholar Ishiyama Hisao, entitled *Can We Yield Our Future to On War?* (「『戦争論』に未来を許せるか」, "Sensōron" ni Mirai wo Yuruseruka,)[63], the author makes no distinction between Kobayashi's work and the work of Society founder and chairman Fujioka Nobukatsu. Though he begins the work by giving a brief description of Kobayashi's argument in *On War* which characterizes the war machine as a necessary appendage to the state, Ishiyama introduces the next section stating, "these arguments are not just Kobayashi Yoshinori's, but I think they find their source in ideas advocated by the Liberal Historiography Research Group's member Fujioka Nobukatsu."[64] Thus having established his excuse to defer Kobayashi's agency to the sign of another, he goes on to spend the majority of the paper dealing with Fujioka's works, not once mentioning Kobayashi over the next twenty five pages. Kobayashi only returns in the last five pages of the work in time for Ishiyama to offer his conclusion that Kobayashi was able to say war is inevitable and necessary by virtue of the fact that he "has completely overlooked the historical achievements [of the anti-war movement] in their effort to achieve peace."[65] Unfortunately, by this time we feel inclined to retort that Ishiyama had made it possible to characterize Kobayashi's work in this light by ignoring his text altogether.

In a disturbing replication of Kobayashi's own negation of life, critics empty Kobayashi's name of all referents to the life lived within and without the constraints that his name defines. By writing him under the sign of neo-nationalism, Ivy mimics Kobayashi's motion to subordinate individual desire to state control by sliding his name under the banner of institutional rule. By naming him a revisionist, Clifford empties Kobayashi's project of all subjective determinations placing the

---

[63] Ishiyama Hisao 石山久男. "'Sensōron' ni Mirai wo Yuruseruka" 『戦争論』に未来を許せるか ("Can We Yield Our Future to *On War*?") in *Kimitachi Sensō de Shineruka; Kobayashi Yoshinori Sensōron Hihan* 君たち戦争で死ねるか；小林よしのり『戦争論』批判 *(Are You Willing to Die for Your Country?)*. (Tokyo : Ōtsuki Booksellers 大月書店, 1999) 147-187.
[64] ibid 149
[65] ibid 186

possibility of a sympathetic (or *sim-pathetic*) encounter with Kobayashi at arm's reach. By simply not making reference to Kobayashi's work, Ishiyama suppresses Kobayashi's voice(s) altogether.

Uesugi Satoshi, author of one of the few book-length criticisms of Kobayashi's work, takes negation one step further in the opening paragraph of his critical work:

> This book is a requiem for my beloved manga artist, Kobayashi Yoshinori. Of course, physically speaking, he's not dead. However, his spirit has died. I am mourning the death of his spirit as a manga artist.[66]

In a weird twist of irony, the name signifying a negation of life is itself written under the sign of this very same negation. Kobayashi is less than dead. His spirit has vanished. He is a war-monger, historical revisionist, neo-nationalist, zombie. He is the mouthpiece for the Society for History Textbook Reform or the Liberal Historiography Research Group. He has lost his individual voice.

By writing his name under the sign of lack, critics of his work avoid dealing with the fact of his "person-ness," thus divesting themselves of all possible implication in the production of what could be conceived as "sympathetic" perspectives to his work. These criticisms place Kobayashi at a furthest possible remove from anything remotely resembling critic or reader in order to strip both parties of any responsibility in producing him *at the very moment they produce him.* When his critics deal with him without reference to the system of reasoning that made his subjective determinations seem reasonable and possible, they create a Kobayashi as part object constructed within the logic of their own subjective determinations. Because criticism on Kobayashi is so uniformly confrontational, his critics, by not acknowledging the effects of their subjective determinations on his emergence in criticism, consign his work to a negational abyss from which there seems no escape. His name becomes the site of negation – the "not-us" or "not-me" – that is flawed because of its lack: lack in perspective ("his histories are partial in relation to *my* more encompassing understanding of Japanese

---

[66] Uesugi, *Anti-Arrogantist Manifesto*. 1.

history"), lack in humanity ("his negation of life is more expansive than my own"), lack in subjectivity ("these are not his words, he is parroting someone else"). This lack, however, is constructed in relation to an assumed greater fullness inscribed into the name of the person speaking.

Though I don't think a completely sympathetic understanding of his work is possible – there will always be slippage under his name, he will always be "someone else" - I don't think a completely unsympathetic strategy of approach is useful in dealing with his text. The aim of the sim-pathetic tactic is to allow for a textual encounter that does not necessitate a foreclosure on or unification of the possible multiplicities that inform the position of the object of criticism.

Defining Sim-pathy

I have chosen the term *sim-pathy* with a specific definition in mind. Though my choice to write the term as a homonym to the term "sympathy" is deliberate, I think connotatively it bears a closer relation to empathy, in that it requires an extension of the imagination to take up the assumed perspective(s) of the individual encountered.

I have tied it homonymically to sympathy for two main reasons. The prefix "sym-" is also the root word for "same," and I use a variation of the term sym-pathy, instead of empathy, partly to keep the idea of *the same* circulating at the surface of this text. Furthermore, I am borrowing my understanding of the ideas underlying this term from Deleuze's treatment of "sympathy" in his work *Empiricism and Subjectivity*.

Deleuze notes "there is a paradox of sympathy: it opens up for us a moral space and generality, but the space has no extension, nor does the generality have quantity."[67] According to Deleuze, sympathy is not something we acquire or learn. We don't begin trapped in an all-consuming egoism from which we find emancipation via sympathy. On the contrary:

> What we find in nature, without exception, are families...We should rather understand the problem of society from this angle, because society finds its obstacle in sympathies rather than in egoism. Without a doubt, society is in the beginning a collection of families; but a collection of families is not a family reunion. Of course, families are social units; but the characteristic of these units is that they are not added to one another.

---

[67]Deleuze, *Empiricism and Subjectivity*, 37

> Rather, they exclude one another, they are partial (*partieles*) rather than made up of parts (*partielles*). [emphasis not mine][68]

We begin within a realm set by partial sympathies. At the same time that these sympathies strengthen our relations to family members, they also necessitate the exclusion of those not included within this tight, familial circle. My mother, siblings, cousins, distant relatives, friends, acquaintances, enemies, and those people I don't know, begin on a hierarchical spectrum that helps me determine their value as human beings. This hierarchization finds direct and indirect expression in the level of violence or suffering I am willing to inflict on the person I encounter. The dilemma I face, if I am to make the assumption that no individual deserves to be a victim of violence or suffering at the hands of another is "how to extend sympathy."[69] An act of *sim-pathy* offers one possibility.

I have not used the term empathy, because the assumption implicit to empathy is that the other's perspective is so uncomplicated and comprehensible that it can be re-created *in toto*. The slippage that is encountered upon realizing the re-created object does not match the object being re-created only further reinforces the subject's position of authority as originator of the essential limits defining the possibilities through which the original may emerge in the copy. In extreme cases of this reductive empathetic stance such as those encountered in orientalist and colonial discourses, the copy's relation to the original is inverted and becomes the origin by which those written as subjects under its zone of power are forced into a mimicry of the copy to satisfy the "empathetic" view of

---

[68] ibid 39
[69] ibid 40

the state authority.[70] The *sim-pathetic* glance, on the other hand, does not aim to occupy the perspective of the other-as-essence (and by so doing prove the subject's superior essence). My imagined construction of another's perspective can only be a simulation of that perspective. There are too many uncertainties and complexities to be accounted for in the perceptions of the person I encounter. By virtue of the limitations of my ability to deal with that kind of complexity, I cannot take up the position of the other person as he is. I can, however, project myself into the position he occupies within the space of our encounter, since that space is a shared space whose complexity has been emptied in order to allow for a smooth circulation of signs. The *sim-pathetic tactic*, because it bases itself on shared space and leaves the "real" of the encountered person marked with a permanent question mark, affords me the luxury of positioning myself in the "space" of the other person's perspective without engaging my valuation of him in a hierarchical logic of identity. I achieve an extension of sympathy, by abandoning the notion that I can take up a *totalized* perspective of the other's point of view, and accept the simulacral nature of the circulation of signs between us in the pre-determined logic of the space of our encounter.

The danger in taking this perspective, however, involves a question of how I am to deal with the complexity or multiplicity of the encountered person's deferred remainder, or what I would call his *sjecitbituvy*. Like a word not yet finding its proper

---

[70] This, however, only gives half the picture as seen from the side of the colonizer. From the other side, this very same mode of mimicry provides possibilities for the colonized to disrupt the authority of the colonial discourse, since, as Homi K. Bhabha has noted in his work "Of Mimicry and Man," "the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an ambivalence; in order to be effective mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference. The authority of that mode of colonial discourse that I have called mimicry is therefore stricken by an indeterminacy: mimicry emerges as the representation of difference that is itself a process of disavowal." Taken from *The Location of Culture* (New York : Routledge, 1994), 86.

order of letters, *the sbjeuct*[71] is that which has not yet determined the order of its entry into subjectivity or that which remains outside its ordering within the encounter.

"All bodies are causes," Deleuze writes in his work *The Logic of Sense*, "causes in relation to each other and for each other."[72] Effects, on the other hand, "are not bodies, but properly speaking, 'incorporeal' entities… They are not things or facts, but events. We cannot say that they exist, but rather that they subsist or inhere… They are not substantives or adjectives, but verbs."[73] Thus Deleuze splits the relationship between cause and effect along lines separating the real from the virtual with cause falling on the side of the real. Writing the relationship of the *sbcejut* to the *subject* according to this distinction between cause and effect, I have placed the *sbjecut* on the side of cause as body of the *denotatum*. Unlike Deleuze, I don't believe this *body* to be completely inaccessible. According to Deleuze, "incorporeal effects are never themselves causes in relation to each other; rather, they are only 'quasi-causes' following laws which perhaps express in each case the relative unity or mixture of bodies on which they depend for their real causes."[74] That is to say, the bodies of causes from which the effects of signification emerge exist as separate and inaccessible to the effects that actually emerge. Effects depend on a virtual estimation of causes to base their emergence on quasi-causes of formation. Thus, complexity is dispersed into the inaccessible field of infinite variation that characterizes the mixing of bodies as cause. In other words, the field of the infinite

---

[71] The spelling of sjbecut and sjbeciivtuty ("pre-subjected" subject and subjectivity) are derived from the notion that a paragraph of text can be read even if all the letters of each word are scrambled under the condition that the first and last letters of each word are left unchanged. The bod(ies) of the subject function(s) in a similar manner offering its/their "pre-subjected" boundaries as finite limit of capacity before the subject emerges into signification as meaningful or meaning producing entity. In order to avoid any indication that this "pre-subjected" limit at the level of the body could be reduced to a static entity, the spelling of sbucjet and sitivucjbety will continue to scramble throughout this paper.

[72] ibid 4

[73] ibid

[74] Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, 6.

functions to close off access to the subject as open possibility in an encounter because of the always already assumed *impossibility* of ever achieving contact with his realm of experience. He will *always* be a function of a virtual quasi-cause. Though I do not contest this – the subject encountered must be constructed by both observer and observed – I do contest the structural effect the notion of the infinite underlying this construction has on the texture of the encounter. In the field of infinite possibility, I am forced to eject the possibility of encountering any kind of harmonization between mixed bodies of the sbucejts involved, because of the impossibility of bodily encounters implied by infinite variation. As a result, the subject collapses onto itself and becomes its own solitary point of reference as whole and nominative entity, because of its inability to indicate the impossible complexity of the mixed bodies of the sbuject.

In order to guard against this collapse of the subject onto itself to form an impenetrable nominative entity, instead of placing the subject over an infinite field as self-referenced singularity, I write it within a *partializing* movement over a finite field. Within a finite field, the *partialized sjbucet* can be maintained in the encounter as a *motion* towards continual open-ness, because in the act of *sim-pathizing,* pathos is given a site to which it can refer as always open *possibility* of contact.

To use *Newton's Second Law of Thermodynamics* as analogy, if I assume a closed system with a set number of elements exists within an infinite field of possible variations, then the variations of that system necessitate a charting of its course from "order" to "disorder" or "low entropy" to "high" because it has nothing but itself to offer as point of reference. If I close off the field of possible variation to inhabit a finite field, but one whose total number of possible states goes beyond comprehension, the subject observing

the system suddenly becomes implicated in the production of the ordering of the system from order to disorder. The observer marks the ordered state of the system as "original order" and the movement towards disorder involves the shifting of states away from this point of origin. This ordered state, however, is not in-itself intrinsically ordered, but only appears that way under the assumption that this ordered state will never return. If the number of states possible is expanded *beyond the boundaries of the infinite* (the infinite in this case seen as a permanent revolution of the boundaries of the comprehensible) into the realm of the incomprehensible, this movement no longer exists as devolution in itself, but emerges as *a function of the limitations in comprehensibility of the observer*. The system may return to the marked ordered state, but the number of variations possible is so high that the chances of encountering this state are lowered to an incomprehensibly small number, *but this possibility is still and always there*. This, then, opens up the possibility of the system to return to itself at any moment, while at the same time flattening the alternation of states of the system to follow a path of mere revolution rather than a path of revolution that works according to a hierarchical ordering of states. That is to say, closing the world to a finite, but incomprehensibly large number of possible variations and states opens up the world to intensities that were paradoxically shut out in the description of a universe governed by the repetition of the extension of comprehensibility to an infinite degree. The *sim-pathetic tactic* depends on this dis-ordering of order to keep the doors to encounters in a continual state of *becoming-opening*.

This act of the *sim-pathetic turn* thus relies on a double movement that first locates the site of sympathy on a simulated surface, and then connects this surface of the subject via pathos to the constant and open possibility of contact with the partializing

movements that act as our shared ground of existence as *becoming-subjects*. Partiality is merely a partiality-as-such in the sense that it does not yearn after a lost totality. This partiality does not seek to complete itself, because it can never be completed. It merely *is* in the same way that my eyes cannot see beyond their visual capacity despite the existence of elements outside my field of vision. In application to my analysis of Kobayashi's texts, the assumption of partiality in the encounter does not speak its logic in apparent fashion in the words of the analysis, but precedes these words in the simple, yet essential decision not to read the object of study as only object. Normally, this kind of understanding is taken as given in any analysis of a text, but because Kobayashi's texts are so controversial and his assertions so contentious, this understanding seems to have been overshadowed by the political necessity to oppose his views. That is to say, the uniformity with which his texts are treated, especially in the few English texts that make mention of his work, seems to indicate an abandonment of the notion that all opinions on this particular object of study are merely that – the result of a re-structuring of the object from selected effects – replacing this notion with a political imperative to dismantle, delegitimize, or simply disregard his claims based on an assumed identity implied by the labels attached to his name. Thus I think stating the obvious in this case, becomes a necessary political act to interrupt the trend towards objectifying the politically abhorrent. Taking a sim-pathetic point of view, and stating the obvious – that all perspectives are partial and beyond the possibility to totalize because this partiality is not one that yearns after totality, but is simply partiality-as-such, becomes a necessary tactic in re-humanizing the debate on the validity of "the fascist's" claims. With this notion of partiality in mind, I am offered the possibility of confronting Kobayashi as a fascist (or

nationalist or militarist), but in a way that does not require the emptying of his name of its reference to a possible multiplicity of motivations or intensities.

To consider a little further the political consequences of this notion of partiality, take for example the color black. Black, I'm told, is not a color. I turn to the Oxford English Dictionary and find its definition:

> The proper word for a certain quality practically classed among colours, but consisting optically in the total absence of colour, due to the absence or total absorption of light, as its opposite *white* arises from the reflection of all the rays of light.[75]

Black is the *absence* of color. Absence. I look out my window at the night sky and find the best example of this absence. Black sky: an infinite absence of color above me written under the sign of blackness. I imagine this blackness to be empty in the same manner that the space between my mug and myself is empty. Though I cannot perceive this emptiness separating the mug from myself, I imagine it repeating again and again into the sky above. Black is the sign under which I write this infinite repetition of the distance separating myself and this mug or that book or that building over there. Black is the sign of nothingness

I think back to my twelfth grade physics textbook, and remember the chapter on light. The color of light, I learned, was the consequence of light waves fluctuating at various intervals. At one end of the light spectrum there was red. At the other end was violet. I also learned that the spectrum of light was not restricted by these colorful bookends. Beyond red there were smaller light waves whose wavelengths were too small to be perceived by the human eye. Infrared. X rays. Beyond violet there were ultraviolet

---

[75] From the *Oxford English Dictionary* [online]. Available at <www.oed.com>

light waves and radio waves, colors whose wavelengths were too large to register on the optic nerve. According to this definition of color black takes on a different meaning. Black is the absence of *color*. Color. I look back into the night sky above and realize, that black is not the sign of an infinite, uniform emptiness. It merely marks the limits of my own ability to represent the colors around me visually. Black is the sign of *incomprehensibility*. I imagine how an astronomer or astrophysicist must look at the sky. Not depending solely on her visual understanding of space, she doesn't conceive of space as empty. The space separating that mug and those books is not marked by an infinite emptiness, but filled with *multiple* intensities. More than just light waves, these intensities have various names and shapes and effects on the world around us: gravitons, atoms, electrons, neutrons, neutrinos, leptons, electromagnetic waves, strings, time. The repetition of this space ad infinitum into the sky doesn't result in the production of a vast uniform nothingness, but the opposite. The black of night is the sign of unfathomable intensities. A collapse of the notion that black is a sign of emptiness results in the re-emergence of the subject into a relationship with the multiple and incomprehensibly complex intensities in the world around him. The fact that these intensities lie outside the subject's ability to take a complete account, however, does not mean that these various intensities are completely inaccessible. All intensities are accessible. They are simply not accessible all at once.

In the encounter with a person this has an influence on how I meet the signs of their existence. These signs act as signposts through which the multiplicity and intensity of a life is unlocked. These intensities, however, do not emerge if I write their difference as whole and empty. I cannot *care* for someone in whom the intensity of an accessible

difference has been foreclosed by notions of emptiness and infinite inaccessibility. Nor can I *care* for someone I encounter as a totalized entity. As either whole or empty, the encountered person loses their intensity as open, multiple possibilities in constant motion to become degraded to an existence as a nominative signifier. Their substance becomes as uniform and unchanging as the substance of this chair, that window, or those clouds above. They become the site of a repetition of comprehensibility. The *sim-pathetic tactic* is aimed at interrupting the disorienting otherliness of another person by keeping them centered on the possibility of their own constantly shifting and multiplying partialized complexity. From this perspective, the encountered person does not become the site of a mere construction supported by a vast empty incomprehensibility beyond our access, but *is* the continuing possibility of encountering modes of becoming that we would not be able to encounter any other way. The encountered person becomes the site of a nexus of lived intensities to which we can connect *because* of our shared existence as *becoming-subjects*. Their erasure through violence[76] or suppression or even mere reduction to a uniform, nominative entity (as in the case of Kobayashi) then becomes on the order of the annihilation of an irrecoverable universe of intensities.

---

[76] By violence I mean to indicate physical violence. The violence of the text is something that cannot be avoided, and my writing of the sim-pathetic tactic is meant, in some ways, to guard against the reproduction of textual violence at the level of the physical as it did in the violence against Japanese nationals during the protests in China, and the retribution visited on Chinese nationals living in Japan.

Section III
Encounters with Kobayashi

In designing a tool for use, as I have with the introduction of the *sim-pathetic tactic*, the designer must face the ever-present possibility that the tool will either be inadequate or will simply fail. In designing the *sim-pathetic tactic*, however, I am also faced with the more worrying dilemma of what to do should it end up working too well. There is the danger that I will end by mechanizing my analysis as it suits the tool. From a particular perspective, it can be said that the tool has the potential to re-define the need it is meant to fulfill and enforce a change to the logic of the problem it was meant to resolve. I need to remove a glass window, and a hammer will speak a different, possibly more destructive logic of removal than would a screwdriver or wedge. Like a symptom infecting its disease,[77] the tool affects and to some degree or another designs the need it satisfies, if satisfaction is what is sought. The *sim-pathetic tactic* as a tool to engage my object of study will transform the logic of my engagement with Kobayashi Yoshinori's works by virtue of its characteristics and the limits and constraints those characteristics have already assumed even before I begin to use it. I cannot avoid this, and in some ways these transformative limits and constraints are the reason I have taken care to design my tool as I have. The *sim-pathetic tactic* is not something to be placed over the object of study, but involves a manner of thinking about the subject as he or she is approached.

A further danger I am wary of, a danger I think haunts all of theory when applied to texts, history, or the world, is that the logic of the tool will enforce a subordination of the presence of the object of study to the mechanisms governing the functioning of the

---

[77] A phenomenon I discuss in the following section.

tool. (In a worst case scenario, the imperative of the mechanism takes a genocidal turn like the one Zygmunt Bauman has shown connects modernity to the Holocaust,[78] a turn which necessitates the elimination of unnecessary or deleterious elements obstructing progress towards the main aesthetic or theoretical goal). In designing the *sim-pathetic tactic* I have not intended to create a wrecking ball to lay waste to all previous notions of the substance of Kobayashi's work. Instead, I hope to imbue the following analysis with only small, subtle changes that will engage tiny ruptures at the level of the *possibility* of an encounter.

I write the following analysis in the mode of *can* and *could* instead of the *ought* or *should* to guard against an inadvertent foreclosure on possible worlds of inquiry (inquiry meant as a process of questioning that does not necessarily need to be aimed towards resolution) that may make themselves available consequent to my analysis. The *sim-pathetic tactic* makes this notion of keeping open the possibility of the encounter a political counter-imperative to the imperative to close, unify, conclude, or totally comprehend.

That is to say, instead of closing Kobayashi's texts by imposing a conclusive mechanism aimed at resolving whatever questions have been raised, be they moral, political, or otherwise, I hope to use *sim-pathy* to open up the text to these questions without cultivating an imperative for tightly knit resolutions. As Naoki Sakai states, "to problematize the enunciative positionality of the observer is to remind ourselves that the object does not exist out there of and by itself, and that, even if it is merely to be

---

[78] "Modern culture is a garden culture…modern genocide, like modern culture, is a gardener's job. It is just one of the many chores that people who treat society as a garden need to undertake. If garden design defines its weeds, there are weeds wherever there is a garden. And weeds need to be exterminated." From *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Ithaca : Cornell University Press, 1989), 92.

described, of necessity it demands a certain participation of the observer. The object of such an epistemic relationship, or what Tokieda Motoki referred to as 'the observational stance' (*kansatsu-teki tachiba*), can take place only on the basis of 'the subjective and participational stance' (*shutai-teki tachiba*). The observation of the object is always accompanied by the observer's 'practice,' and unless the student has a practical relation to his object, he or she cannot have an epistemic relation to it either. My proposal, therefore, is that the sense of theory should be steered toward evocation by questioning rather than settlement by solution."[79] It is this aim towards "evocation by questioning" that I direct the rest of this paper.

Furthermore, I will only be using this tool in a partial manner. In the following pages, I don't intend to take account of *all* the changes, transformations, or ruptures that can be affected to a text as a consequence of using the *sim-pathetic tactic*, since this would require an expansion of the realm of my inquiry that goes well beyond the time and space that I have available in writing this paper. I reserve a more detailed exploration of the possibilities for analysis using the *sim-pathetic tactic* to my doctoral research. For the present, I want only to focus on one or two of the possible "mechanical effects" that emerge when taking the *sim-pathetic* perspective.

Naqoykatsi

There is a particular image in the film Naqoykatsi[80] that provides a fitting analogy for one of the effects I see emerging as a result of taking a sim-pathetic perspective on

---

[79] Sakai, Naoki. *Translation and Subjectivity; On Japan and Cultural Nationalism.* (Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1997) 118-119.

[80] *Naqoykatsi, Life as War*, Dir. Godfrey Reggio, Prod. Lawrence Taub, Joe Beirne, and Godfrey Reggio, (Miramax Films, 2002).

Kobayashi's work. This image begins as a stream of wriggling white line segments on a black background moving in what seem to be relatively straight trajectories from the outer boundaries of the screen to a pulsating white light at the center of the screen. As the segments make their way towards the center, a secondary entity in the form of a dark ring emerges from beyond the edges of the screen, and follows the same trajectory towards the center. Once it reaches the center it blots out the central light completely leaving the white segments to float untethered in an overwhelming darkness. Contrary to expectation, what results from the elimination of the center is not an image of broken segments now moving in unison towards an empty center. Although the movements of the segments themselves have not changed, in the absence of a center, they are released from their linked uniformity to trace independent motions on the screen. The white entities only appeared, through some visual trick, to move in unison towards the center of the screen when that center was occupied by a dot of the same color. In the absence of this centralizing entity, the lines were released from the perceptual trick.

In the following pages I hope to enact a similar transformation to Kobayashi's work, through the use of the *sim-pathetic tactic*. In most criticisms of Kobayashi's work, his name becomes the centralizing principle around which interpretations of his work become organized. The name Kobayashi is repeated throughout a text under the assumption that these references, like the white lines of the image in Naqoykatsi, all lead the reader on a trajectory towards an originary notion of a whole, singular identity: "Kobayashi the neo-nationalist," "Kobayashi the historical revisionist," "Kobayashi the manga writer." Kobayashi's effects as they appear in his manga and in his actions in the world are used as indicators all pointing to the same center. Taking a sim-pathetic

perspective of his work, in part, involves juxtaposing my perspective over the possible space this center is assumed to occupy. By placing myself in this particular space I become like the dark ring blocking out the radiance of a brilliant, organized center of focus. I block out the idea of his object-ness which until this moment offered itself as centralizing principle to his work. The Kobayashi of the center, the Kobayashi around which his effects are meant to organize themselves is shifted beyond the limits defined by my partiality in the same way his body would disappear were I to stand in his exact place. What results is a release of Kobayashi's effects from their devotion to this assumed center allowing them to chart their own independent, sometimes interdependent, sometimes conflicting trajectories through space.

In sim-pathy, however, I do not assume complete sovereignty over the space at the center. This is a *sim*-pathetic move, not a sympathetic one, and as such the integrity of our difference is still kept as contingent consideration. In placing myself in the position of "origin" to Kobayashi's effects, I extend my own subjective position to inhabit a simulated world in which I may contingently encounter the effects of his work without "becoming" him as the "more real than real" standard for comparison. In placing myself in a position to view each effect individually without reference to an object center – Kobayashi as that wholeness over there now become this possible subjectivity here where I stand – I place myself in the nexus of criss-crossing patterns of inter-relation, while the univocal Kobayashi as only "fascist," "neonationalist," or even "manga artist" fragments into pieces that are given their own space to emerge independently of, yet still possibly interrelated to, one another.

1. Kobayashi, The Fascist

I can say Kobayashi is a fascist. It is surprising how easily I can say this. There is an overwhelming amount of evidence to prove me right. This evidence, however, can only provide the signs of fascism through which the person marked by their signs can be interpreted. A problem arises when I am faced with the problem of what to do when faced with the possible consequences that could arise following the discovery of this particular ordering of signs. Before I address this problem, however, I will start by ordering the signs of Kobayashi's fascism.

In order to mark Kobayashi as a fascist, it is necessary to come up with a functioning definition of fascism. This, unfortunately, is not as easy as it sounds. In nearly every text that I have looked to for a definition of fascism the writer always begins by qualifying his definition with a preliminary disclaimer. Roger Eatwell begins his work "Towards a New Model of Generic Fascism" stating "Fascism? Arguably no other term in common political usage has bee so debased, often serving little more than a term for abuse of opponents."[81] Stanley Payne opens his volume *The History of Fascism, 1919-1945* with the words, "At the end of the 20th Century fascism remains probably the vaguest of major political terms."[82] Stephen Shenfield when writing on Russian fascism begins his chapter "Defining 'Fascism'" by stating "the multiplicity of meanings and connotations with which the word 'fascism' is used remains a fertile source of confusion and misunderstanding."[83] In "The Five Stages of Fascism," Robert Paxton borrows an

---

[81] In *Fascism; Critical Concepts in Political Science, Volume One: the Nature of Fascism*, edited by Roger Griffin, and Matthew Feldman (New York : Routledge, 2004) 221.
[82] Payne, Stanley, *The History of Fascism, 1914-1945* (Madison : University of Wisconsin press, 1995), 3.
[83] Shenfield, Stephen, *Russian Fascism: Traditions, Tendencies, Movements* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2001) 3.

opening used by St. Augustine when dealing with the problem of defining "time" and one repeated in Heidegger's introduction to the dilemma of defining "Dasein" when he points to the relative ubiquity of the term despite its ambiguous meaning: "At first sight, nothing seems easier to understand than fascism…yet great difficulties arise as soon as one sets out to define fascism." [84] Gilbert Allardyce defers to the words of S.J Woolf in the opening paragraph of his polemic against all use of the troublesome term writing, "Perhaps the word fascism should be banned, at least temporarily, from our political vocabulary."[85]

Faced with these opening caveats, I am given pause in assuming the term for my own use. How am I to characterize Kobayashi as fascist, if the term itself is ambiguous. After some consideration, though, I realize that these same apprehensions could be applied to most any word. The notion that the term "fascism" should be discarded because it does not provide a seamless match to what it is meant to signify seems a tad absurd. Were this standard kept to all of language, I don't know that I would be able to say anything. There will always be slippage under the sign. There will always be an asymmetry between the signifier and signified. Taking this into consideration while assuming, then, that there are features that distinguish generic fascism from other "isms" such as communism, liberalism, and socialism, if I were to use these features to mark Kobayashi's work as fascist, I should expect to discover that his project corresponds more closely with some notions of fascism and not others. What I find, surprisingly, is that his work shares a close correspondence with a majority of features used in a variety of works that give a definition of fascism. For the sake of brevity, I have provided only a

---

[84] Griffin, *Fascism; Critical Concepts*, 305.
[85] "What Fascism is not; Thoughts on the deflation of a Concept," in Griffin, *Fascism; Critical Concepts*, 176.

sample of possible comparisons below that could be made between Kobayashi's fascism and generic fascism.

Robert Paxton and The Five Stages of Fascism[86]

Robert Paxton provides a list of seven "mobilizing passions"[87] he believes act as undercurrent to the drive of all fascist ideologies in his work the "Five Stages of Fascism."[88] Kobayashi's work finds motivation in some form or another in the majority of these passions.

1. The Primacy of the group, toward which one has duties superior to every right, whether universal or individual.

In Kobayashi's *On War*, the primary oppositional binary around which the rest of the text circulates pits the "public" (公, kō) versus the "individual" (個, ko) in a confrontational battle over Japanese identity where public interest through several elisions of the definition of "the public" comes to represent both nation and state interests. When trying to locate the source of moral decay in Japan, Kobayashi writes in the first volume of *On War*, "In post-war Japan, people have rejected the Japanese state (国家, kokka), thus, by leaving community standards as something unsought after; that is, by rejecting a sense of community, the people are left with no alternative but to head towards individualism.

---

[86] Though Peter Duus and Daniel Okimoto have made the case for abandoning the use of fascism when referring to Japan's political systems and intellectual history in "Comment: Fascism and the History of Pre-War Japan: The Failure of a Concept" in *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 1, (Nov. 1979) 65-76. I have chosen not to take their perspective into consideration for the simple reason that they are addressing Japan's past and the validity of referring to fascism's emergence and its influence on wartime Japan. More than half a decade has past since then, and I think fascist ideas have had plenty of time and opportunity to filter into the culture, if not in discrete political form, at least in its more invasive ideological form. Also, when Kobayashi himself refers to "fascism," he does not refer to a Japanified version, but seems to borrow its meaning from its European tradition.

[87] Griffin, *Fascism; Critical Concepts,* 308.

[88] Ibid 305-326

People of all ages, from adults to children, have lost their sense of public duty."[89] Riding this elision between public and state interests, Kobayashi constructs a hierarchy of values whereby national interests take the position of value transcending all other interests, individual, global or otherwise.

> This is not for the sake of the left (左翼, sayoku), nor for the sake of the Shallow, Naive Left Wing Citizen's Group (サヨク, sayoku)[90] nor for my own individual interests. This is for the people! Even by changing "for the people" to "for the country," don't these indicate the same thing?...for the sake of the nation, we mustn't discriminate against the Buraku people... for the sake of the nation, and because the Aum are dangerous, we mustn't devote ourselves to religion[91]... for the sake of the nation we must never let our children be influenced by Marxist anti-Japanese textbooks. In the hands of the Lefties', national interests are subordinated to human rights and the search for the creation of an egalitarian society. That is to say, in a 21st Century run by Anti-war peaceniks, the state is thought to be better off dead... The left are thinking in terms of the people,

---

[89] Kobayashi, *On War*, 101

[90] Kobayashi distinguishes between two kinds of left wing liberalism, "Those that have been easily taken in by this 'remnant of the left' I call the 'Shallow, Naïve Left Wing Citizens Group.' There is no reason to believe they uphold the distinct beliefs of the left. Instead they are moved by human rights, egalitarian, freedom, feminism, and Peace loving Anti-War ideologies ...thus, I name those influenced by Marxist ideologies 'Leftists' (左翼) writing their name using Chinese characters, while those that are blindly dragged by civil liberty values into becoming part of the anti-authoritarian, anti-state bourgeoisie I call 'Lefties' (サヨク) using katakana to write their name." *On War*, 23-25.

[91] The Aum was the religious cult responsible for the bombing of the Tokyo subway stations in 1995 that resulted in the deaths of 12 people. Kobayashi went to "war" with the Aum organization early on in his career before the subway attack. Later on, the Asahi Shimbun discovered an assassination list put together by the organization, and Kobayashi's name was found on this list. Since then the organization has served as his ever-present reference for comparison to any group he believes accumulates members through the use of brainwashing and religious inculcation (this list of groups includes left wing organizations, and government institutions).

> but these people are not the people of this nation, but the people of the world. I am for the nation. The left, as well, as the Lefties are for the world...[92]

In Kobayashi's view the nation and state as represented by the people of Japan take precedent over all interests whether they be individual or universal. National interest is placed at the top of his hierarchy of values.

2. The belief that one's group is a victim, a sentiment which justifies any action against the group's enemies, internal as well as external.

Kobayashi argues that the Japanese aggression in Asia committed during its project to create the *Great East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere* was understandable and inevitable. Japan was not the aggressor in this war, but a victim attempting to defend itself against the encroachment of the colonialist powers as they took over more and more of East Asia. Engagement in war was inevitable.[93] The loss of life, Chinese, Korean, Japanese or otherwise, was tragic but inevitable. After all, this was wartime.[94]

This same logic of victimization serves his purposes in his denial of the Nanjing massacre. After accusing the Chinese military of arming civilians and thus making it difficult for the Japanese military to distinguish between soldiers and innocent

---

[92] Kobayashi, *On War*, 342-3.

[93] "Had you been born at this time, had you been the leader of Japan stuck in the middle of this situation, and had you managed to evade war what with U.S. Imperialism spreading on one side and Chinese and Russian Communism spreading on the other, could you have come up with a plan to protect Japan? Even if you were able to come up with something, it would be completely meaningless. A person can only exist within the conditions and emotions of their times. Those that ignore the sense of necessity of that era, and can say 'There was a feeling they would lose,' are an irresponsible and untrustworthy lot." *On War*, 33.

[94] "The Japanese Military treated the lives of its soldiers with too little regard. Also, because it was a war, some soldiers that became uncivilized could be found in the ranks, and it's possible they committed wretched acts that could be condemned as criminal according to military law. Though I regret the existence of this negative side of the war... Regardless, I give applause to the Japanese military that meted out punishment to the racist, white western powers who could not see the yellow races as anything more than monkeys, and colonized East Asia..." *On War*, 29-30.

bystanders, Kobayashi states, "I refer you to Ōi Michiru's *The Staging of the Nanjing Massacre*. Though there is plenty of evidence to show that women and children were killed during the Nanjing Incident, if these women and children were armed civilians then there was nothing to be done (仕方がない, shikata ga nai)."[95] In either of the above cases, atrocity, violence, and invasion are all justified actions because they came consequent to the victimization of the Japanese by foreign powers. The Japanese soldiers who committed these atrocities are assumed to be pure and noble in spirit. After all, they understood the importance of protecting national interests and were willing to sacrifice themselves to preserve the sovereignty and dignity of the Japanese state.

3. *Dread of the group's decadence under the corrosive affect of individualism and cosmopolitan liberalism.*

The corrosive effect of liberalism and individualism forms the kernel of Kobayashi's argument for the necessity to rejuvenate the Japanese national spirit. As mentioned above in the introduction to his works,[96] Kobayashi points the finger at liberal ideology and radical individualism forced on the Japanese people by the U.S. following their defeat in the war for the decay of modern Japanese society.

4. *Closer integration of the community within a brotherhood (fascio) whose unity and purity are forged by common conviction, if possible, or by exclusionary violence if necessary.*

Though Kobayashi's sense of community is supposed to include all Japanese, men and women alike, he provides very little room for female desire or agency in the framework of his nationalism. When Kobayashi refers nostalgically to the spirits of Japan's past, he

---

[95] Kobayashi, *On War*, 128.
[96] See page 22-23 above.

persistently uses the term "sofu" (祖父) or "grandfather" rather than using the more egalitarian term "sofubo" (祖父母) which includes the character for "mother" (母) in its construction to mean "grandparents." Since Kobayashi's construction of Japanese identity depends heavily on the necessity to acknowledge and respect Japan's ancestral lineage, by writing this lineage under a sign that does not acknowledge the existence of women, he hearkens back to a past that is devoid of female agency. Though women do appear in his work, they inevitably fall into subservient roles. That is to say, Kobayashi seems unable to perceive women beyond their functional relationship either to himself or other men: as prostitutes, as dutiful wives, as mothers weeping over their sons, as young girls trembling in the presence of soldiers heading out to certain death, as rape victims.[97] Thus, it could be said that his community is a brotherhood, since there is no female agency in Kobayashi's manga world. That this brotherhood is forged by a common conviction as well as through exclusionary violence becomes apparent once Kobayashi's pro-war/nationalist stance is taken into consideration.

5. *An enhanced sense of identity and belonging in which the grandeur of the group reinforces individual self esteem.*

Kobayashi's project to instil pride and "arrogantism" into the Japanese people on the basis of a shared past of heroism in the face of Western aggression, seems to speak to this point. Kobayashi places primary value on the maintenance of the interests of the nation as a community (kō), and suggests that in the absence of the sense of belonging

---

[97] This blindness is not restricted to women. As I will later argue, Kobayashi cannot see any of the characters he creates, or the public figures he lampoons beyond their functional value. In the case of his depiction of women, however, the roles available are more restricted, since these roles define themselves according to a patriarchal ordering of values.

and public duty that comes part and parcel with this kind of maintenance Japanese society has begun to fall into moral decay and narcissism.

6. *Authority of natural leaders (always male) throughout society, culminating in a national chieftain who alone is capable of incarnating the group's destiny.*

Beyond writing himself as the uber-arrogantist to his project to "arrogantize" Japan, Kobayashi gives no indication that he longs for the emergence of an authority figure to take control of Japan's destiny. In fact, Kobayashi believes himself to be an anti-ideological writer, and so, more often than not, uses authority figures who cling to ideology to maintain their power as fodder to further his project of rejuvenating a Japanese spirit gone flaccid in the hands of obsequious politicians and the pro-U.S. liberal left.[98]

7. *The beauty of violence and of will when they are devoted to the group's success in a Darwinian struggle.*

Though Kobayashi does not go so far as to "emphasize the moral character of violence, its importance in generating a sense of seriousness, commitment, purpose, solidarity, and common bonding"[99] as George Sorel does in *Reflections on Violence*, nor does he imbue his manifesto with the rabid desire for blood that fuelled the project of the Futurists, the precursive fascist artistic avant-garde of pre-WWI Italy who set the tone for the emergence of Mussolini's Fasci di Combattimento,[100] his texts celebrate violence and the

---

[98] Though this feature of Kobayashi's work may seem to counter Paxton's understanding of one motivating passion underlying fascism, it falls in line with other descriptions of fascism that have it emerge from anti-establishment inclinations. Emilio Gentile gives the following as one feature in his ten-point description of "fascismo," in his contribution to the *Enciclopedia Italiana* (1992), "2) an 'anti-ideological' and pragmatic ideology that proclaims itself antimaterialist, anti-individualist, antiliberal, antidemocractic, anti-Marxist, is populist and anticapitalist in tendency..." Quoted in Payne, *History of Fascism*, 6.

[99] Payne, *The History of Fascism*, 28

[100] "The original Futurist manifesto of 1909 declared:

1. We want to sing the love of danger, the habit of energy and rashness.

will that makes it possible in more oblique and socially acceptable ways. His glamorization of violence finds its best example in a chapter praising the suicide squads (特攻隊, Tokkōtai) for their selfless acts in driving planes, single-man submarines, small boats, and gliders into enemy vessels. Kobayashi draws on letters left behind by the members of the suicide squads to loved ones and family members to deepen the poignancy of their violent sacrifice. He depicts this violence in images borrowed from action hero manga: planes driving unstoppable through flack and fire to come crashing down on their terrified and unsuspecting enemies (see figure 2), suicide squad soldiers standing in line, saluting the reader while the Japanese flag flaps in the wind behind them, suicide boats weaving through explosions and machine gun fire to reach their enemy target – a destroyer looming black and ominous in the background. He parallels the suicide pilot's selfless and beautiful sacrifice to his own selfish attempt to preserve his dignity during a sumo tournament in which he participated as a child. "All I did [during the tournament] was stand up for myself," Kobayashi writes against a backdrop image of soldiers staring defiantly out towards inevitable death, while the figure of himself as a child crouches dirty and bruised in the corner of the frame, "The suicide squads threw away their lives for the sake of the people. I threw away my pride to serve my own selfish interests. Though both the squads and I were willing to place defeat on the line and stand up to our enemies with a do-or-die attitude, the things we were fighting for were completely different."[101] Though Kobayashi would later go on to deny that he

---

2. The essential elements of our poetry will be courage, audacity, feverish sleeplessness.
3. .... We want to exalt movements of aggression, feverish sleeplessness.
9. We want to glorify war – the only cure for the world – and militarism , patriotism, the destructive gesture of the anarchists, the beautiful ideas which kill, and contempt for women."

Ibid. 64.

[101] Kobayashi, *On War*, 92.

intended to glamorize violence in *On War,*[102] the images in this segment of clean cut soldiers standing under a clear sky with planes flying in perfect formation overhead, or images found in later segments of heavy artillery blasting into a line of enemy soldiers in the distance, or Japanese battleships cruising under a sky filled with fighter planes all headed towards the perfect circle of a rising sun (see figure 3), seem to speak for themselves.

Roger Griffin's Fascism: Critical Concepts in Political Science, and Stanley Payne's The History of Fascism, 1914-1945

Roger Griffin gives a more concise definition of fascism in his general introduction to the five-volume collection entitled *Fascism: Critical Concepts in Political Science*:

> … 'fascism' is usefully defined as a revolutionary form of nationalism bent on mobilizing all 'healthy' social and political energies to resist the onslaught of 'decadence' so as to achieve the goal of national rebirth, a project that involves the regeneration (palingenesis) of both the political culture and the social and ethical culture underpinning it.[103]

Stanley Payne offers a similarly succinct definition in the introduction to his *History of Fascism, 1914-1945* which shares in Griffin's characterization of fascism as organizing itself around nationalist sentiments. Payne writes,

---

[102] "Since the publication of On War, everyone has misunderstood my intentions, and it's because the Marxists, anti-nationalists, and the left wing media pundits have all been saying the same thing: 'He glamorizes (美化, bika) war!' I have praised the display of bravery shown by young soldiers who were protecting their motherland. There was no glamour in these memories of war." *On War 2*, 37. See page 113 for full quote.

[103] Griffin, *Fascism; Critical Concepts*, 6.

> ...fascism may be defined as 'a form of revolutionary ultranationalism for national rebirth that is based on a primarily vitalist philosophy, is structured on extreme elitism, mass mobilization, and the *Führerprinzip*, positively values violence as end as well as means and tends to normalize war and/or the military virtues.[104]

With the exception of features that would have fascism structured on extreme elitism,[105] and the Führerprinzip, Kobayashi's project in *On War* seems to fulfil all the above characteristics for qualifying it as a fascist work. As mentioned above, his is a palingenetic project to rejuvenate Japanese nationalism and resist the "onslaught of decadence" that has resulted from the absorption of western style liberalism and individualism. Kobayashi tries to appeal to a mass audience by writing in a popular medium. He even goes so far as to admit that his primary aim in writing is to make his manga as appealing as he can to his public, stating, "Until the end, though, my work will always be interesting, peculiar, and enjoyable. If I happen to put together a sound argument, then so be it."[106]

---

[104] Payne, *The History of Fascism*, 14.

[105] Kobayashi's fascism seems to be structured on an extreme anti-intellectual, anti-elitism similar to the trend in German fascism that placed importance on the value of populist ideas and culture. This emphasis on the will of the "people," however, hides what ultimately turns out to be the same elitist inclination mentioned above. Kobayashi believes he writes for the people, and attempts to justify this by writing in the voice of the "people" by steeping his work in colloquial language. On the other hand, he makes the careful distinction between himself and the "people" he writes for by placing himself in an elite group of professionals – such as the ones sharing membership in the Society for History Text book Reform – who know how best to corrupt institutions and mobilize masses. This inclination emerges most clearly in his work *On Post-righteousness* when he is faced with the "incompetence" of the university students he has joined forces with and sighs at their lack of professionalism. "What the hell can students do? Investigating the truth, and maintaining countermeasures. After that, they enter the domain of lawyers, doctors, politicians, journalists and the like. This is the domain of professionals. What in God's name can these amateurs accomplish?" *Shin Gōmanizumu Special; Datsuseigiron 新ゴーマニズムSpecial脱正義論 (The New Arrogantist Manifesto Special; On Post-Righteousness),* (Tokyo : Shōgakukan小学館, 2000), 84.

[106] Kobayashi Yoshinori 小林よしのり. *Gōmanizumu Sengen 2 ゴーニズム宣言 2(The Arrogantist Manifesto, Volume 2),* (Tokyo : Gentōsha 幻冬舎, 1993), 8. See page 104-5 below for full quotation.

There are numerous other parallels I can make between Kobayashi's work and the structure of fascism: his anti-intellectual tone as a manga artist,[107] his emphasis on the importance of youth culture[108] and his attempts to persuade them through manga and middle school textbooks, his voiced ambivalence towards both right and left[109], his use of the manga genre to create modern mythic hero tales of Japanese nobility,[110] his naturalized xenophobia,[111] the use of accomplishments by Japan's forefathers in the past to dominate the present and define the future.[112] It seems traces of fascism are laced

---

[107] George Mosse points out this feature as it appeared in German fascism, stating, "[Emphasis on activism] and the irrational foundations of their world view represented strong opposition to intellectualism. Hitler summarized this point of view in 1938: 'What we suffer from today is an excess of education. Nothing is appreciated except knowledge. The wiseacres, however, are the enemies of action." From Mosse, *Nazi Culture*, xxvii-xxviii.

[108] Most fascist scholars mark this as a common trait of most fascist movements. George L. Mosse writes, "This emphasis on youth is common to most revolutions, and was employed by the National Socialists from the very beginning. To be vigorous meant to be youthful, the 'new man' of heroic will had to be a figure of youth." From *Nazi Culture; Intellectual, Cultural, and Social Life of the Third Reich.* (New York : Grosset &Dunlap, 1966) xxxiii. Stanley Payne in a similar vein writes, "Nearly all revolutionary movements make a special appeal to young people and are disproportionately based on young activists...Fascist exaltation of youth was unique, however, in that it not only made a special appeal to them but also exalted youth over all other generations, without exception..." From Payne, *The History of Fascism*, 13.

[109] Stanley Payne lists the fascist negations in a table providing the Typological Description of Fascism. They are "Anti-liberalism, anti-communism, and Anti-conservativism." Like the fascists, Kobayashi, despite his aversion to taking sides, was "willing to undertake temporary alliances with other sectors, most commonly with the right." (Payne, *History of Fascism*, 7) Thus, Kobayashi could align himself with such conservative scholars as Fujioka Nobukatsu and Nishibe Susumu.

[110] In this same manner, "The Nazis enthusiastically annexed the fairy tale and folk legend to their cause. However, this vision of the future was rooted in the past, it was the traditional fairy tale which the Nazis used in creating their emphasis on the modern Volk." From George L. Mosse's "Toward a General Theory of Fascism," in Griffin, *Fascism; Critical Concepts*, 148.

[111] Next to his misogynistic attitude towards women, Kobayashi's xenophobia is another characteristic of his work held constant between his pre and post fallout with the left. The foreigner is always used as a generic "other" (meant in its most reductive understanding) as contrast to the humanity of the Japanese subject. Kobayashi does not view his xenophobia for things not-Japanese as conflicting with his anti-racist attitudes expressed in his work *On Racism*, because his racism involves relations between different elements of Japanese society. He does not acknowledge his depictions of the devious Chinese, and the condescending, barbaric white man as racist, because his racism finds definition only within national boundaries. This tendency matches Stanley Payne's characterization of fascist movements when he states that though they were not necessarily racist, "[a]ll fascist movements were nonetheless highly ethnicist as well as extremely nationalist, and thus held the potential for espousing doctrines of inherent collective superiority for their nations that could form a functional parallel to categorical racism." Payne, *History of Fascism*, 11.

[112] "Yet the maxim that 'history is human fate' meant emphasis upon racial ancestry, that the accomplishments of the past dominated the present and determined the future." Mosse, "Toward a General Theory of Fascism," *Fascism; Critical Concepts*, 165.

throughout the text of *On War*. If this weren't convincing enough, there are always the words of the writer himself. In the first volume of his self-published magazine entitled *Wascism* (Or Me-ism), Kobayashi makes it clear that he has based the title of the magazine as a play on the word "Fascism." "Fascism means 'to hold a group together,'" he explains, referring to the derivation of the term from the Latin *fasces,* meaning "bundle" (that "originally referred to the bundle of lictors (rods with protruding axes) carried by the judges of ancient Rome, symbolizing justice, unity, and the sovereignty of the Roman Republic"[113]). Kobayashi goes on to explain, "Without thinking, people assume its something to be guarded against, but [Fascism] is not all bad. I, obliged by my strong sense of values, will dare to pick up this gauntlet to become the leader [to bring the group together]. Thus I have named this magazine 'Wascism.'"[114] This along with the above seems to provide ample evidence proving Kobayashi's ties to fascist ideology.

Even if I were to believe Kobayashi a fascist, and under the above burden of proof I feel compelled to do so – to an extent – my main concern wouldn't be with whether or not he was a fascist. I could say a lot of other damning things about his work. The list of epithets I could use seem unending – neo-conservative, ultra-nationalist, neo-nationalist, historical revisionist, hawk, warmonger, right wing ideologue, etc. Any of these terms would suffice in marking his work as "dangerous." The more pressing question for me,

---

[113] Payne, *A History of Fascism*, 81.

[114] Kobayashi, Yoshinori 小林よしのり、 *Me-ism, わしズム, Vol.1, Washizumu Volume 1.* (Gentōsha : Tokyo, 2002) 19. The term "fascism" in Japanese is borrowed from the English. It is written in Katakana and is pronounced *fasheezumu.* Kobayashi's pun for the title of his magazine, pronounced "*Washee*zumu" (written Wascism when Romanized) uses the term "Washee" - which is a colloquialized form of the more formal term Watakushi meaning "I" – to echo the pronunciation of "fasci" in "*fashee*zumu," and then linking this echo to the Japanese pronunciation of the English morpheme "-ism." Kobayashi makes frequent use of the "Washi" pronoun when referring to himself throughout the Gōmanizumu sengen series. Use of this pronoun connotes a strong masculine flavor in contrast to the more feminine "Atashi."

however, has more to do with the possibility of believing his work to be fascist while still being able to approach him merely and awe-fully as another person.

As I have said before, in labeling Kobayashi a fascist (or neo-nationalist or revisionist), I put myself in danger of being trapped in a blinding binary logic. His name becomes the homogeneous territory of a contemporary evil, and I write myself as the voice of a more forgiving righteousness. I become the sign of his unraveling and somewhere lost in the clash of our unified identities is the mere multiplicity of a person. The seemingly natural resolution to this problem would require I abandon the label.

I could write Kobayashi without the epithet and let the quality of his work emerge according to its own merits. Though this seems the most reasonable choice, I think it merely defers the problem without engaging with it. George Orwell once wrote on fascism asking the question "Why, then, cannot we have a clear and generally accepted definition of it? Alas! We shall not get one – not yet, anyway. To say why would take too long, but basically it is because it is impossible to define Fascism satisfactorily without making admissions which neither the Fascists themselves, nor the Conservatives, nor Socialists of any colour, are willing to make. All one can do for the moment is to use the word with a certain amount of circumspection and not, as is usually done, degrade it to the level of a swearword."[115] As much as I agree the term is ambiguous, I am reluctant to agree that its use in the pejorative sense should be avoided. Were I to assert that Kobayashi Yoshinori was a fascist, I would want to mean this in its most pejorative sense. There need be some means in a system of signification for marking those ideas, tropes, and cycles of logic that have proven "dangerous" in the past through their association with atrocities like the Holocaust, the Nanjing Massacre, the

[115] Griffin, *Fascism; Critical Concepts*, 51.

organized mass rape of the comfort women, so that we may learn to recognize the possible return of their legacy in the present. The fact remains that Kobayashi writes according to an ideological mode of textual production that shares similarities with the fascist works of the past. He himself admits it. If I chose not to acknowledge this, I not only overlook a key aspect informing the production and organization of meaning in the work, I place myself in danger of blinding myself to the possible averse affects that may arise from this work. Furthermore, Kobayashi does not speak to a small minority of devout neo-nationalists or neo-fascists, but addresses a varied and interested public that responds to his writing, sometimes aversely, as the protests in China prove, and more often then not on a strong emotional level as the following fan letters show:

> From a 15 year old high school student living in Tokyo.
>
> This was the first time I've ever cried reading manga. I also noticed something. The idea that people say they are best off serving their own interests, or that freedom is 'number one' made me angry. I spoke with my parents about the ideas in your book and they said, 'You can't resist the times." But I don't care. Even if it means being seen as a villain, I will resist.[116]

> From a 15 year old Junior High School student
>
> Reading this gave me the feeling of waking up from a long sleep. When I hear that Japan has never apologized for the wrongs committed in the war, I have always thought, "Well, they'd better apologize promptly," but now I feel my own irresponsibility and lack of knowledge keenly in having

[116] Kobayashi, *The New Arrogantist Manifesto 6*, 131

> thought this way. Take care Mr. Kobayashi, and don't give up. Your book was very moving.[117]

His text needs to be marked in some way to warn us of the possibility of the political impact of his words.

Yet, there is a danger in defining fascism or the fascist solely on the basis of its features or "symptoms." In defining fascism according to its symptoms, and then using these symptoms to locate or chart the development of fascism's emergence as the "disease of the twentieth century" that gave rise to genocide, total war, and atrocity, the fascist scholar falls in danger of dealing with fascism as though it were a uniform disease that could be diagnosed and treated through recognition of its symptoms. Fascism's symptoms are its effects, and these effects are organized in a centralized fashion to point towards the fascist center as cause. I could give this cause the label "generic fascism" and use it to locate and diagnose those fascisms, like the one put forth in Kobayashi's work, that have re-emerged in contemporary society. In order for this symptomatic approach to have any validity, the symptoms as effects must transcend their individual existence as singular effects to come together under the sign of generic fascism. Fascism then becomes the absent fire projecting its light and shadows on the wall of perception.[118]

The danger in organizing fascism's definition in a symptomatic fashion becomes apparent when I take into account its necessary pejorative meaning. As transcendent principle, fascism too easily takes on the characteristics of an essentialist notion, making it possible to turn symptoms into the causes instead of the effects of the disease. That is,

---

[117] ibid 113

[118] As Stanley Payne points out, "It is doubtful that there is any unique hidden meaning in, cryptic explanation of, or special 'key' to fascism…Fascism possessed distinctive political and social doctrines, as well as economic approaches, but these did not stem from any one source and did not constitute an absolutely discrete new economic doctrine." Payne, *History of Fascism*, 487.

if fascism is organized according to a transcendent principle of its effects, the thing, be it a text, person, or ideology, marked by fascism falls in danger of being infected by its *symptoms*. This normally doesn't prove itself a problem if the "disease" diagnosed is considered benign. I tell people I am a Graduate student, and become infected with the symptoms of this diagnosis. They see that I look tired, wan, and generally disinterested, and think that I must be a graduate student, because this is what graduate students look like. In the case of a term like fascism which is haunted by the pejorative, a diagnosis carries with it the imperative for treatment. Fascism is dangerous and, because it is uniformly constituted, the only possible treatment must be its complete removal or suppression. Fascism leads to the possible development of a fascist attitude towards its treatment.

Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari and the Fascist BwO

Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari offer an alternative to this symptomatic description of fascism in *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Before giving my account of their description, however, I think it is important that I point out two assumptions I am making with regards to Deleuze and Guattari's texts. First, I am assuming there is some theoretical consistency between Deleuze's earlier work, especially with *The Logic of Sense* and *Difference and Repetition*, and his later work with Guattari in *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Specifically, I link Deleuze's description of sense in *The Logic of Sense* to the development of the Body Without Organs (BwO). The BwO is *sense*, or, at the very least, a kind of *sense*. Just as the BwO is "unproductive, the sterile, the

unengendered, the unconsumable"[119], so *sense* is neutral and sterile[120], and "non-consumable...to the edible nature of things."[121] Just as the BwO is "preexistent," and "awaits you; it is an inevitable exercise or experimentation, already accomplished the moment you undertake it,"[122] *sense* "is like the sphere in which I am already established in order to enact possible denotations, and even to think their condition. Sense is always presupposed as soon as *I* begin to speak"[123]

Secondly, I am following Michel Foucault's assumption expressed in his preface to the English edition of Deleuze and Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus*:

> Last but not least, the major enemy, the strategic adversary is fascism... And not only historical fascism, the fascism of Hitler and Mussolini – which was able to mobilize and use the desire of the masses so effectively – but also the fascism in us all, in our heads and in our everyday behavior, the fascism that causes us to love power, to desire the very thing that dominates and exploits us... How does one keep from being a fascist, even (especially) when one believes oneself to be a revolutionary militant? How do we rid our speech and our acts, our hearts and our pleasures, of fascism? How do we ferret out the fascism that is ingrained in our behavior? The Christian moralists sought out the traces of the flesh lodged

---

[119] Deleuze, *Anti-Oedipus*, 8
[120] Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, 31
[121] ibid 25
[122] Deleuze, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 149
[123] Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, 28

> deep within the soul. Deleuze and Guattari, for their part, pursue the slightest traces of fascism of the body.[124]

In focusing solely on a reading of fascism in Deleuze and Guattari's texts, I understand that I am like a petty thief breaking into the Louvre only to come away with the cash from the registers. I don't intend to take a full account of all that is going on in Deleuze and Guattari's texts, since I don't think this is possible in such a short work (if in fact this is possible at all). Deleuze and Guattari's text is nothing if not dense with ideas, and my time is restricted and pockets shallow.

Deleuze and Guattari's contribution to fascist studies derives from their reworking of the relationship between cause and effect and their re-determination of fascisms place within this relationship. In contrast to the above mentioned symptomatic description of fascism which rests on a linear understanding of the relationship between cause and effect, Deleuze draws on the Stoic distinction which sees cause and effect as two different kinds of things, then links this understanding to David Hume's reasoning that effects do not emerge naturally from their causes, but are linked to them in the imagination via associative processes. As I mentioned earlier when dealing with the deferred remainder of sbcjuiivetty,[125] Deleuze splits cause and effect across the divide between the virtual and the real. He then places depth on the side of bodies, but it is a depth out of reach. When speaking of Humean causality, Deleuze has already determined that there are only effects. [126] Instead of rooting effects in depth of an

---

[124] From Michel Foucault's preface to Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Capitalism and Schizophrenia, Volume 1: Anti-Oedipus*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1980) xiii.

[125] See page 59 above.

[126] "Association is a law of nature and like every other law, it is defined by its effects, not by a cause…the fact is that philosophy, being a human science, need not search for the cause; it should rather scrutinize

accessible real, Deleuze, following Paul Valery's belief that "what is the most deep is the skin,"[127] inverts the Platonic notion of depth to allow everything to return to the surface.[128] "One could say the old depth having been spread out became width,"[129] so that meaning could root itself, not within the being of substance, but in an "impassive extra-Being which is sterile, inefficacious, and on the surface of things."[130] Instead of placing cause and effect in direct relation to each other, Deleuze forces the Stoic split on the two necessitating the introduction of a third simulacral surface acting as medium from which effects could justify their emergence. This is the surface of *sense*, a surface not oriented according to notions of truth and falsity, but between the reasonable and absurd. It is here where Deleuze and Guattari, in a revolutionary inversion of the causal relation, locate the site of fascist production.

In *Anti-Oedipus*, the medial surface of sense takes the form of the *BwO* and the simulacral site of fascist production takes on the form of the *fascist BwO*. A key characteristic of the *fascist BwO* is its pre-subjective nature. Deleuze and Guattari do not locate the 'origins' of fascist desire within the logic of a predetermined subjectivity, but write it previous to subjectivity's emergence. Thus, desire itself *can* be determined through the machinations of a fascist surface of sense. The desire to centralize, dominate, the lust for authority, and its logical complement, the desire to be lead, are not subjectively determined desires – that is, desires to be acknowledged by the conscious individual – but desires that articulate themselves in the manifestation of a subject. From

---

effects. The cause cannot be known; principles have neither cause nor an origin of their power. What is original is their effect upon the imagination." Deleuze, *Empiricism and Subjectivity*, 25.

[127] Quoted in Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, 10.

[128] ibid 7

[129] ibid 9

[130] ibid 7

this perspective, Deleuze and Guattari write fascism, not as the exception to the rule, but as the normative mechanism through which subjective experience *can* be organized. The fascist BwO hates the intensity of organs qua machines exuding intensity across vast networks of connective syntheses. The fascist BwO is paranoid of what might be articulated through the inherent uncertainty of unchecked connectivity, and so uses its body as sterile site of anti-production to enforce the production of production (disjunctive synthesis), and the production of inscription (conjunctive synthesis) in order that it may write power and control over a system that once only spoke flow.

According to this reading of fascist effects, fascism itself can be said to begin as a particular way of reacting in the face of uncertainty beyond comprehension. Fascism begins as a paranoia of the incomprehensible and builds for itself a system through which incomprehensibility can be indefinitely deferred beyond the "margins" of a system determined as infinite. The fascist BwO offers its surface as sterile, impenetrable flatness to pose as this unencounterable margin. From here, identity and production can be inscribed onto its surface and organized to circulate without reference to the incomprehensible. Across the surface of the fascist BwO everything is made accountable.

This description of fascism, in some ways, resolves the problem of my encounter with the fascist. If I take it as understood that the very formation of both the fascist's and my subjectivity result from a similar process, then the fascist mentality becomes accessible to me not as something beyond my realm of experience, but as implicit to the structure of subjective experience. In taking up this notion of fascism, however, I seem to be in danger of replacing one problem with another. Where I was originally faced with

the dilemma of trying to keep the human under the sign of fascism, by placing the productive engine of fascism at a pre-subjective level I have inverted the relationship to inscribe fascism as a constitutive aspect of the human. If I am to write fascism in light of its historical effects – Mussolini's Italy, glorification of violence, exclusionary nationalism, Total War – the strength of its pejorative connotation threatens to wipe out the intricacies inherent to its inter-relation with notions of the human. The human then absorbs the stain of fascism through the paranoia of the association, but now this stain has seeped beyond the surface logic of the encounter of identities to threaten to bleach out or homogenize the productive furnace of signification itself.

Deleuze and Guattari move to counter this problem in *A Thousand Plateaus* by withdrawing the term "fascist" as a fixed qualifier to the BwO. The *fascist BwO* becomes merely one variant in an indefinite array of possible BwOs to be created. The creation of these is then made contingent to deterritorializing and reterritorializing currents within signification. Yet, despite this move to free the BwO from fixing itself to a single mode of *anti-production*, and taking into consideration its structural roots in virtuality, the BwO continues to appear strangely resilient. Deleuze and Guattari characterize it as an impenetrable, sterile surface, but seem reluctant to acknowledge that this impenetrability is merely simulacral. That is to say, this surface may emerge as impenetrable and sterile, but because it is constituted as the simulacral approximation of relations between effects to form "quasi-causes" there seems to be no real imperative for it to function this way. Although the BwO may hate organs and the intensity consequent to connectivity, it does not physically work to eliminate them at the level of sense. The BwO only provides the illusory surface upon which the belief in the virtual presence of "quasi-causes" is made.

Real erasure (genocide, violence, suppression) occurs *post-factum*, and is only made possible if sense is *believed* to be impenetrable.[131] This belief doesn't emerge as directed at the surface of sense, but motivates action in response to effects that emerge consequent to this belief. I don't wish for the death of a confrontational "other entity" knowing that I've decided to believe in the impenetrability of the logic by which I encounter this entity as something else. I desire its/his/her erasure based on my unquestioning attitude towards the organization of effects. This unquestioning attitude only becomes impenetrable and believable if I assume the territory of knowledge available to me is fully comprehensible. My subjectivity and world are full, and I believe I have taken account of all possible contingencies that fall within the limits of accountability. All else vanishes into the void of the infinite, and unreachable.

Fascism is not just a dream of stability facilitated by the workings of the BwO, but is a dream within a dream of a total and comprehensible world. Deleuze and Guattari set the stage for the unraveling of this dream by placing fascism at the level of virtual

---

[131] This criticism against Deleuze and Guattari's seemingly resilient ground of sense is not unique. Deleuze's work has been criticized in a somewhat similar, but more in-depth fashion by Alain Badiou in his work *The Clamour of Being* (University of Minneapolis Press, 2000) and Slavoj Zizek in *Organs Without Bodies; On Deleuze and Consequences* (New York : Routledge, 2004). Badiou specifically targets Deleuze's description of Being as univocal ground to the emergence of difference for criticism. He writes, "the question posed by Deleuze is the question of Being. From beginning to end, and under the constraint of innumerable and fortuitous cases, his work is concerned with thinking thought (its act, its movement) on the basis of an ontological precomprehension of Being as One." 20. In response to this Badiou offers Being as originally and necessarily multiple before the One can emerge. It is this notion of the multiplicity of being I mean to indicate by characterizing the BwO as "mottled." In a critique of Deleuze and Guattari's description of micro-fascism, Zizek states, "Deleuze and Guattari (especially Guattari) often indulge here in a true interpretive delirium of hasty generalizations: in one great arc, they draw the line of continuity from the early Christian procedure of confessions through the self-probing of Romantic Subjectivity and the psychoanalytic treatment…It is here, against such generalizations, that one should evoke the lesson of Laclau's notion of hegemonic articulation: fascism emerges only when the disperse elements start to 'resonate together.' In fact, it is only a specific mode of this resonance of elements (elements that can also be inserted into totally different hegemonic chains of articulation)" 191. In keeping with this sense of fascism as emerging consequent to a resonance of elements and not simply consequent to the appearance of elements, I have tried to fashion this section in such a way as to show how different resonances sound throughout Kobayashi's text that seem to counter his fascist inclinations at the same time that they could also be said to support this image of him as a fascist.

quasi-cause rather than real symptom. Yet, they fail to enforce that unraveling, and instead inject its surface with the logical impenetrability of infinite revolution. By placing the real as inaccessible because of the infinite possibilities for variations of mixed bodies, Deleuze and Guattari give the BwO the appearance of a "real" impenetrable homogeneity that can *only* be ruptured via lines of flight that chart courses out of the domain established by this impenetrable surface. By steeping this conceptual system within the constraints of the infinite, they give themselves no means by which to acknowledge the possible existence of a pre-subjective subjectivity (siiuebjcvutty) that can influence the "form" of the BwO through the productive aspect of its partializing movements. Thus, instead of unraveling the dream within a dream of fascism, they reinforce the fixity of the *fascist BwO*'s virtuality by injecting it with an infinite logic that transforms virtuality into a kind of necessity.

On the field of the finite, however, there is no necessity for the *fascist BwO* to exist as uniform or impenetrable site of anti-production, but can take on a more mottled aspect, the mottling marking simultaneously existing sites where it *can* been penetrated by the partiality of sbjiittcuevy. Thus, my encounter with another marked by symptoms of fascism, as with my encounter with Kobayashi Yoshinori, does not require either an emptying of this other persons "human-ness" due to an infection of symptoms or the inscription of my own "human-ness" as uniformly stained by the virility of the other person's fascism. Kobayashi Yoshinori the fascist can be marked by fascism's effects, but these effects, though stained with the pejorative, and hinting at a possible danger in the productive aspect of his work, are not preceded by the necessary production of his "humanity" as uniformly fascist or fascism as uniformly human, but emerge merely as

virtual possibilities within an intricate network of relations between the virtual, real, sign, sense, subject, sjbuect, finite, and infinite.

2. Kobayashi, The Rebel

Parody

Though critics like Uesugi and Yū Miri are inclined to distinguish Kobayashi's earlier work in children's manga and his work in the first few volumes of the Manifesto series as distinctly different from his later, seemingly more conservative work dealing with the comfort women and Japanese nationalism in the *On War* volumes and the *New Arrogantist Manifesto*, I do not see that there has been as distinct a change in the aims and structure of his work as they believe. When faced with the apparent contradiction between Kobayashi's stated motivations for his Manifesto writings in the past that triumph an anti-ideological and looking-out-for-the-little-guy attitude and his more recent conservative work, they are inclined to write the contradiction off to a change of heart brought on by his ejection from a University protest group, and his susceptibility to the influence of conservative commentators like fellow TV personality Nishibe Susumu. "A third reason [for his turn towards conservativism]," Uesugi writes after attributing the change first to Kobayashi's indignation at being ejected from the student group by a bunch of amateurs, and then to his inclination towards upholding a paternalistic attitude which sees rebellion against the father figure, himself in this case, as a sign of an overindulgent upbringing, "has to do with his final surrender to his opponent [during his involvement with the Aids Support Group], conservative critic Nishibe Susumu." [132]

As untenable as it would be to argue that Kobayashi was not influenced by fellow society members like Nishibe Susumu and Fujioka Nobukatsu into taking up the

---

[132] Uesugi, *The Post-Arrogantist Manifesto*, 20.

nationalist banner, or that his falling out with the left didn't push the tone of his work further to the right (Kobayashi himself admits abandoning his leftist leanings in one issue of the Manifesto; he does not, however, characterize this as a move to the left, but more a move away from inflexible ideology[133]), I also think it would be too dismissive to attribute the change in tone of his work to a complete transformation of intentions of objectives.

Looking over Kobayashi's body of work, one sees that his aims as a parodist, that is, to transgress, or subvert the expectations that come with the medium in which he works, have not weakened or died out since his move to social satire, but in fact have strengthened and expanded into a kind of anti-ideological rebelliousness towards certain elements in Japanese society (specifically, what he sees to be left-wing notions concerning Japan's participation in the Second World War).

Kobayashi's transgressive sense of humor is best illustrated in the disturbing images he presents in the short work published in the eighties entitled *Brute Love*. The story begins as a high school romance story, the kind most commonly found in the pages of shōjo (少女) manga.[134] He begins in a manner befitting the genre; the first frame has

---

[133] See Kobayashi Yoshinori, 小林よしのり, "Supplement to the 1999 Paperback Edition," 文庫のための描き下ろし1999、Bunko no Tame no Egakioroshi 1999 in The Arrogantist Manifesto 4、ゴーマニズム宣言４、Goumanizumu Sengen 4 (Gentō Paperback Publishing, 幻冬舎文庫、Gentōshabunko, 1999). 55 – 68.

[134] The major distinctions made in manga exist along gender lines. Shōjo (young girl) manga and shōnen (young boy) manga are given separate sections in stores. They are bound differently. Shōjo manga covers are predominantly designed with red titling against a white background, whereas shōnen manga are given more freedom in their variety of bindings. Shōjo manga are further distinguished by the material they cover and the style of drawing that is used. Schodt writes, "To the average male, stories for girls often seem to feature nothing but pretty, leggy, saucer-eyed heroines in saccharine plots, endlessly falling desperately in love or staring wistfully into space; sometimes it seems that manga for adult women are only a more mature variant of the same, with the addition of sex. A hallmark of both manga for girls and manga for women, however, is that, compared to manga for men, they are more stylized and introspective, with a greater emphasis on emotion and human psychology." Schodt, *Dreamland Japan*, 155. Shōnen manga, on the other hand, are typically focused on what are considered to be "boylike" themes; samurai stories, hero

Yukie and Shinya, the two star-crossed protagonists, straddling a motorcycle while behind them the sun sets over a gloriously beautiful beachside landscape. The next frame shows Yukie staring in wondrous awe at the spectacle while Shinya discards his high school uniform behind her. Finally, in the last frame on the opening page, the two lovers race gaily down to the beach for what we expect to be an evening spent frolicking and playing over sand and surf. A turn of the page and the reader's expectations are brutally dashed to pieces as the frames explode with violent images showing Shinya kicking, punching and throwing Yukie all over the beach as blood spurts from her mouth with the characteristic splash most commonly associated with the violent samurai stories found in the pages of a shōnen manga. Throughout it all, Yukie grits her teeth, screams in pain, then comes crashing to the ground in the last frame, her legs spread in the air while her high school uniform flips up to allow the reader a peek at her undergarments – the trademark fetish image of most shōnen manga (see figure 4). The next page offers the explanation of this violent clash of male and female genres as Shinya is shown thanking Yukie for her help as his karate sparring partner. Yukie whispers her gratitude for being allowed to help, a soft glow of love shining from her bruised and battered face.

What follows is a love story gone tragically wrong. Shinya is forced to move away when his father is transferred to a different city. Yukie's life falls apart in Shinya's absence as her family is evicted from their house by debtors and she is forced into a life of prostitution. When Shinya returns years later, his reunion with Yukie is made bittersweet when he discovers that she is dying of cancer. Distraught by her impending

---

stories, space adventures, war adventures, mysteries, and gag comics. Of course the variety in both fields goes beyond these narrow definitions, but a large percent of mainstream manga are produced according to these stereotyped notions of what the average Japanese boy and girl would like to read.

death, Yukie finally kills herself and dies in Shinya's arms whispering with her last breaths, "The cancer didn't win, after all…Goodbye…"[135]

In terms of plot line *Brute Love* is neither unique nor original. This is the same melodramatic story arc that can be found repeated ad nauseum in the pages of popular shōjo manga and daytime Japanese television dramas. Kobayashi's manner of telling the story, however, is anything but bland. As he does in the opening pages of the manga, he engages the reader in a continual assault on their expectations. When Shinya meets one last time with his high school sweetheart before he must move away, he offers her a token by which she can remember him. This token, however, doesn't come in the guise of the expected banal memento of love found in most romance stories– jewelry, flowers, some small trinket drowned in reminiscent sentimentality. Instead, Shinya gives a gift far more fitting to the violent nature of their relationship: a chained sickle. When Shinya and Yukie meet again years later, what should be a romantic airport scene of lovers running into each other's arms turns bloody as they misjudge the distance separating themselves and crack heads. In a wickedly parodic turn of signs, Yukie is infected with cancer, not at a physical level, but a semantic one. When speaking with the doctor taking care of Yukie's injuries following her mishap at the airport, Shinya misinterprets a lascivious and paedophilic remark made by the doctor concerning Yukie's "childlike face" (dōgan, 童顔), as a more serious diagnosis revealing Yukie's affliction with "cancer of the body" (dōgan, 胴癌). Finally, in a disturbing climax to the story, Yukie chooses to kill herself during a beachside performance of the tricks she'd learned using the sickle Shinya gave her so many years ago. In the midst of her grand finale, she tosses the sickle up high with

---

[135] Kobayashi Yoshinori 小林よしのり, *Ijō Tensai Zukan 異常天才図鑑 (The Illustrated Guide to Abnormal Genius)*, (Gentōsha Paperbacks 幻冬舎文庫, 1997) 185.

enthusiastic verve, but then pulls it down on herself and lets the point bury itself in her forehead (figure 5). The tragic parody ends with the final image of Shinya carrying Yukie's dead body out to sea while the moon rises round and beautiful in the sky before him.

Taken too seriously, this story, along with a good portion of Kobayashi's work in children's manga, makes no sense as a comedic tale. What is funny about watching a young girl get beat up by her boyfriend, fall into a life prostitution, and then kill herself in a grisly fashion? Aren't these images of Yukie's violation, and then death ultimately misogynistic? Are these images appropriate in a manga aimed at an audience consisting of pre-teen and teenage males?[136] As Kobayashi is quick to point out when this same argument is made against his work in the Manifesto series[137], the point is that his manga are not meant to be taken too seriously. The characters are caricatures drawn as parodied elements of an original whole that itself is purely conceptual. Yukie is not a girl. She is the concept of the kind of girl one expects to find in the romantic tales most commonly found in shōjo manga: young, naïve, and willing to do anything to preserve her love. As such we're not meant to care for her as though she were a person. The gags only work if she is the shallow sign of an abstraction of life. She is the Coyote from the Roadrunner cartoons, the nameless enemies killed by the hero in an action movie, or the victim of violence spoken about on the six o'clock news. Her existence as a person is made irrelevant by the necessity to communicate *the idea of her as being a person.*

---

[136] *Brute Love* was originally published in a 1985 supplementary edition to Shōnen Champion (少年チャンピオン) a weekly manga magazine with an readership consisting mostly of young males of high school age (though, as with all shōnen manga, a large per cent of the readership includes adult males).

[137] See page 104-5 for Kobayashi's vocal response to those readers who don't get the point of his manga.

What is at work in these pages, and in the pages of Kobayashi's Manifesto series, is a calculated attack on conventional modes of expression and reading. By confronting his readers in his earlier work with confounding and often violently disturbing images, Kobayashi disrupts the reader's assumptions and expectations with regards to how they read. In the case of a parody of manga genres as is found with *Brute Love*, he flips convention on its head via the use of parody by repeating the signs of a particular genre, and then transgresses them in order to unleash new intensities onto the page. In the machine of his parody, the images and words are placed on a trajectory towards becoming that which they are meant to parody, and then transgress the copy of this original by following too closely to the arc of becoming. In *Brute Love* the story is placed on an arc towards becoming a young-love romance tale, but the images adhere too strictly to the masculine and feminine stereotypes that allow this kind of story to function. Shinya must exhibit his masculinity through action, and does so in the opening pages by displaying his mastery of a martial art. Yukie must display her obedient passivity as the stereotypical female lover. What better way to show this than by having her physically accept the signs of Shinya's masculinity over the surface of her body. Bruises and blood become the penultimate sign of Yukie's love and her willingness to sacrifice anything for Shinya. The fact that this violent interchange occurs during a sparring practice – a situation which pits the participants in what should be a play of violence - seems appropriate for this overdetermination of signs - each punch and kick and spurt of blood punctuating a slip between the expected acts of fore/play between lovers and their actual manifestation on the surface. The process of becoming inflates and ruptures across the too pregnant signs of itself, and unleashes unsettling encounters with radical images of

difference. Are we meant to laugh at Yukie's battered but loving gaze? Are the paedophilic statements made by the doctor and the play on these comments supposed to be funny? Is the image of Yukie with a sickle protruding from her forehead meant to produce giggling and chuckles? Asking these questions, however, leads the reader to question why these images seem less appealing than the ones given in a typical shōjo manga when the underlying structure and stereotypes are the same. Where is one supposed to draw the line when dealing with a popular medium like manga? Does appeal count for everything?

When this same transgressive aesthetic is turned towards social commentary, Kobayashi begins to truly press the envelope on taboo and transgression, but the aims of his writing seem to remain the same. Instead of a parodist working within the realm of manga genres, Kobayashi becomes the rebel fighting against what he sees to be a society stuck in ideological stagnation preserved by the public's unquestioning attitude towards its wartime past. He is not happy, however, to follow the standard path of the rebel, targeting only the expected conservative figures of authority in Japan. Instead, guided by his troubling encounter with an ideologically driven organization while participating in rallies and demonstrations against the Japanese government during the 1980's, he decides to focus his attention on what he conceives to be this particularly naïve, yet dangerous faction in Japanese society: the ideologically driven liberal left. Thus, in maintaining his aims to challenge his readers' expectations and transgress the rules of what is considered "proper" or "polite," he casts aside his persona as mere comic parodist and takes up the identity of anti-ideological rebel.

Anti-ideology

There is ample evidence to prove Kobayashi intends to use his Manifesto to fight against dogmatic and ideological modes of thinking. His call to the people of Japan to "speak their mind" is written as a call to shake off compliant ways of thinking that don't question dominant ideologies. He intends to introduce a diversity in thinking into the Japanese political landscape that pays no heed to the contradictions that threaten this diversity. In the second instalment of the series, he calls his readers to embrace contradiction declaring, "It is better for human beings to remain steeped in contradiction. If we need thought that is wholly consistent and well reasoned, we can leave that to the work of robots and computers. Comrades, don't be afraid of contradiction. It is only speaking your mind magnificently and from the bottom of your heart!"[138]

Keeping to this mandate, Kobayashi provides for his readers his own admittedly partial, often contradictory, and always in-your-face brand of social commentary in the pages of the Manifesto. Using his skills honed from years writing gag-style manga, he takes on subjects with a flare for the dramatic and a revolutionary's enthusiasm. Covering everything from pornography in manga to his relationship with a Yakuza boss, to his involvement in the protests against the Ministry of Health and Welfare to commenting on the comparative sizes of Japanese and foreign penises, Kobayashi does all he can to stir up controversy and open a forum for debate on the most current taboo topics in Japanese society. By the tenth instalment of his Manifesto, Kobayashi has already received proof that his arrogantist tactics have taken effect when he begins receiving letters of criticism directed at his comments on the difference between a foreign

---

[138] Kobayashi, *The Arrogantist Manifesto* 1, 11

male's penis and Japanese male's penis. In true arrogantist fashion, he publishes one of these letters and shouts its arguments down with his own unabashed opinion, meanwhile applauding the writer's audacity in challenging his authority by bestowing the title "Arrogant letter" (ごうまんレッター、gōman rettaa) on the fan's submission. From this point on, Kobayashi would maintain this open, yet critical relationship with both fans and critics, frequently publishing hate mail, fan letters, and critical editorials from the Asahi Shimbun, and the Sankei Shimbun in the pages of the Manifesto.

By the time he publishes the second collection of the Manifesto series, however, it becomes apparent that his tactic has become too successful. Having stirred up so much controversy on so many topics he has found himself awash in hate mail and criticism, Yoshirin, Kobayashi's comic alter ego, is forced to take a half-step outside the context of his project to give a meta-critical explanation of the motivations fueling the series. Not fully willing to abandon his arrogantist persona, Yoshirin offers this self-reflective summary of intent as diatribe against critics who have obviously missed the point of his work.

> What the hell is with all this malice?...All these letters have missed the point of the content of my writing. They're angry because of a misunderstanding fostered by their seemingly complete lack of appreciation for the subtlety of expression in gag-style humour. Lots of people, especially those in the media, have expressed their concerns to me. "Is this kind of thing really all right?" or "Haven't you experienced objections or resistance from different organizations?" If they were proper organizations, they would be able to see beyond the surface of the material

> to the core of what I was getting at, and they wouldn't feel compelled to object. To be honest, the really scary ones are the biased people who misinterpret the material...there are those out there complaining, "Still as ever he writes as though he thought himself so grand." It's the Arrogantist Manifesto! If I didn't write in a "grand" manner, I'd have to call it the Humble Pie Manifesto!! Others tell me, "Stick to statements that reflect reality and common sense!" Common sense? From me? In this series? This isn't the Sobriety Manifesto! Who the hell wants that sort of thing? My fans would start a riot!

Instead of intimidating Kobayashi to back down from his project, criticism has the contrary effect, fortifying his resolve to continue to speak his mind.

> This has powered me up even more. My arrogance shall blast over my critics like a tempest. Until the end, though, my work will always be interesting, peculiar, and enjoyable. If I happen to put together a sound argument, then so be it. Really, though, I could careless whether or not my arguments come off as sound.[139]

Kobayashi seems to thrive on the belief that he is a radical voice of resistance to dogmatic or common sense modes of thinking. Fortunately for Kobayashi, over the next decade he would find no end of opposition from critics, scholars, politicians, and private organizations. He would invite litigation by declaring "war" on the Aum cult, the religious organization responsible for the VX-gas bombings of the Tokyo subway system. When his name is found on a list of assassination targets compiled by the cult, instead of backing down, he becomes even more active and vociferous in his denunciations.

---

[139] Kobayashi, *The Arrogantist Manifesto 2*, 8-10.

Kobayashi's radical anti-ideological stance finds its best expression when he describes his involvement with the above mentioned university group to protest against the Japanese governments attempts to cover up the use of HIV tainted blood on hemophiliac patients. Initially acting as spokesman for the AIDS Support Group, he uses his Manifesto series as a means to advertise rallies and demonstrations. When he begins to notice the organization's gradual shift towards designing its tactics according to the staid ideology of the righteous left, he begins to publicly question their motivations, a move which eventually results in his ejection from the organization.

Following his ejection, Kobayashi goes on to publish an entire volume of his Manifesto series, entitled *On Post-Righteousness* (脱正義論, *Datsuseigiron*) specifically detailing the gradual decline of his relationship with the left-wing student group. Yoshirin is shown beginning to question the student group's motivations following a demonstration during which they abandon his idea to storm the Ministry of Health and Welfare's cafeteria to have an "Eat-in." Instead the group opts to focus their protest on grandstand speeches followed by an ineffectual march through Hibiya Park during which the protesters all hold hands to form a "human chain" of solidarity. Upset with the self-righteous and naive tone of the demonstration, Yoshirin is shown growling, "People who come solely for the sake of proving themselves right, aren't they more like the dangerous followers of the Aum cult. Their conduct is based on ideology!"[140]

He starts to truly lose faith in the group when he notices the once child AIDS victim poster boy turned adult spokesman for the support group begin to use the group

---

[140]Kobayashi Yoshinori 小林よしのり、Datsuseigiron 脱正義論 (On Post-righteousness) (Tokyo : Gentō sha 幻冬舎、1996) 25.

and his weight with the media to push ideas concerning Japan's war time past that Kobayashi feels are unrelated and possibly counter-productive to the aims of the group. When he finally sees the AIDS Support Group get taken over by an ideologically driven left-wing labour organization which begins to enforce its own agenda on the group instead of listening to the desires of the original university members, Yoshirin publishes an issue of the Manifesto series expressing his opinion that the student group is becoming less like a loose organization of like-minded individuals, and more like an ideologically driven institution similar to the one they have come together to protest against. In a vicious invective against this move towards ideology, Yoshirin comments, "I wonder if you young kids see it. If you continue on the path you're on, you'll enter the workforce just like everyone else, and pretty soon you'll be swallowed up by the same kind of institution you are fighting against. Next time it'll be you on the side that is killing people with indifference."[141] Soon after publishing this issue, he would be asked to resign from the group. This forced resignation would mark his final break with left-wing ideology.

In the *On War* series that has drawn so much criticism, Kobayashi makes it very clear time and time again that his main target of criticism is this very group of left wing ideologues. Read as a critical attack on this very narrow segment of the Japanese population, *On War* does make sense, not at the level of its contentious assertions, but in its underlying desire to mark a particular version of history that would have the Japanese soldiers that participated in the war occupying the role of villain, aggressor, invader, and rapist with a question mark. In the same way, Kobayashi confronted his reader with the

---

[141]Kobayashi, *On Post-Righteousness*, 93

confounding and brutal images in his shōnen manga to stir the assumptions and expectations of his readers, he confronts the readers of *On War* with a version of history he believes is seldom given voice in Japanese society to stir readers' accepted notions of Japan's role in the Second World War and have them begin to question these notions.

A Voice for the Voiceless?

Another motivation fueling Kobayashi's writing that has remained constant throughout the Manifesto series is his desire to provide a voice for what he perceives to be the weak and powerless in Japanese society. In the opening pages of Kobayashi's *On-Racism* (差別論、sabetsuron) special to the series, Yoshirin traces this motivation back to his days as a weakling child whose physical frame was kept frail by asthma. A recurring episode in Kobayashi's work focuses on his humiliating defeat at a local kid's sumo tournament. Too weak to be of any threat to any of the other competitors, young Yoshirin is humiliated in front of his friend's and parents as he is tossed over and over again out of the ring. Though Kobayashi would return to this episode in his *On War* volumes using it as a means to contrast his own narcissistic motives to the selfless sacrifice of World War II suicide pilots,[142] the episode originally appears in the first volume of the *Arrogantist Manifesto* as a means towards criticizing those who take advantage of the weak. "A pox on muscle heads," Yoshirin declares, "Bring down Brawny Bozos! One day this world will become a paradise for the weak, and until that day I will fight to see it come true!"[143]

In *On Post-Righteousness* when addressing his motivations for agreeing to become the spokesperson for the AIDS support group, Kobayashi points to his soft spot for children as the main factor influencing his decision.

> I turned the position down. To have my name taken down as the representative - me, a manga writer taking on the responsibility for other

---

[142] See page 79 above.
[143] Kobayashi, *Arrogantist Manifesto 1*, 41.

> people's lives! But I couldn't bear the thought of those children I'd met dying off to AIDS... I took the position. Because I was a longtime writer of children's manga, this was my weak point. I had to pay back the debt I owed to these kids.[144]

In one of Kobayashi's moist poignant issues in the series, Yoshirin tells the story of his days as a kindergarten student excluded from playing with the other children because of his debilitating condition. Unable to make any close friends during playtime, he is left standing alone during lunch period while all the other kids are encouraged to sit in groups with their friends (see figure 6).

> Everyone made their groups. Everyone placed their lunches on their desks, and they looked so happy. But what was I supposed to do? I was helpless, alone, and miserable. I just wanted to disappear. But then...this other boy was there. I remember this other boy was always left out of things because he was a little slow. I was relieved. I wasn't alone because he was there with me, and he seemed relieved too. "Great," I thought, "I'm so happy he's here with me." So what if he was a little slow. Now he was my friend. Something like warmth passed between us. "What?" the teachers suddenly saw us standing there, "What's wrong? Don't you two have friends you can sit with? Who would like to include these two in their group?" A boy I'd met before called out my name, "Ah! Yoshirin! Come here! Come here!"... But, as I left to join the group, I saw the slow boy had such a look of distress on his face. But I was called away. I was

---

[144]Kobayashi, *On Post-Righteousness*, 16.

called to join the normal kids. I didn't know any better. I let you down... I'm not a bad kid! I just got mixed together with everyone else. I had to go. I'm sorry. I'm so sorry... I'm sorry.

Even now when I think of that time, I get a pain in my chest. Since then, I've always thought, I was such a coward.[145]

***

Thus, contrary to his image as a war-mongering nationalist, the Kobayashi encountered above cuts a seemingly gentler, more critically inclined figure. The same can be said, in a way, for the Kobayashi that appears in the *On War* volumes. In *On War* Kobayashi writes Yoshirin as the voice of radical opposition, just as he had done since the first installment of the series. Beginning the second chapter of the first volume with images of Japan's foremost socialist and liberal leaders shouting out anti-war slogans like "Japan once waged a war of invasion!" "We colonized Korea!" and "Apologize for your crimes!" Kobayashi prepares the ground for his anti-ideological stance by painting a picture of Japanese society plagued not only by the narcissism of radical U.S. individualism, but by the naive gullibility and hypocrisy of liberal supporters and the obsequious submission of their leaders to Western ideals. Aware of the implications of opposing what he believes to be the liberal ideas of democracy, human rights, freedom, equality, and peace, Kobayashi indulges in wicked parody of himself as the ultimate embodiment of anti-enlightenment ideals. "I will be the villain to the air of shallow liberalism pervading Japan," he declares, drawing himself in the likeness of a demon.[146]

---

[145] Kobayashi Yoshinori 小林よしのり, Gōmanizumu Sengen Supesharu; Sabetsuron ゴーニズム宣言スペシャル；差別論(The Arrogantist Manifesto Special; On Racism), (Tokyo : Gentōsha Paperbacks 幻冬舎文庫, 1998) 9-12.

[146] Kobayashi, *On War*, 25.

Though his depiction of the left seems to fall in line with standard "western" conservative notions of the "bleeding heart" liberal, I am reluctant to give in to this association. Kobayashi's attack on the left is waged on a more conceptual level. He does not feminize his depictions of them in his manga as would be expected from a male conservative view of the left, but depicts them as starry eyed automatons similar to religious followers. He attacks them, not for being physically weak, but for being too easily taken in by ideology. The foundation of Kobayashi's attack on the left seems best expressed in a statement made in an interview following the publication of *On Post-Righteousness*. When asked to define what he meant by the term "righteousness" – his favourite term of disparagement used against the left - Kobayashi had the following to say.

> When expressing one's own perspective on what is right, one's sense of right is useful, and so we're likely to put it to use. However, we should always keep doubts about our own feelings of righteousness. We need to always mark our ideas with a question mark. Regardless though, we have no choice but to adopt a position whenever we speak. It is impossible to state that we can take up a position without making a decision on what we think is right.[147]

Kobayashi conceives of himself as an anti-ideological rebel and targets that segment of the left that champions ideology and its ideal of liberty, equality, and democracy above all other more worldly concerns. Lambasted by critics on all sides for his pro-war

---

[147]Cited in Kawamoto, Takashi 川本隆史. "'Chokkan to Rikutsu' ni Kinkō wo Toru Doryoku wo Hōki Shita Gōmanizumu no Hōhōteki Hatan" 「直観と理屈」に均衡を取る努力を放棄したゴーマニズムの方法的破綻 ("The Failure of a Method: Arrogantism's Abandoned Effort to Strike a Balance between 'Reason and Intuition'") from *Ronza: Kobayashi Yoshinori "Sensōron" Hihan* 論座:小林よしのり『戦争論』批判 *(The Seat of Debate: Criticism of Kobayashi Yoshinori's On War)* 44, (December, 1998). 200.

standpoint expressed in the first volume of *On War*, Kobayashi uses the second volume of the series to solidify his anti-ideological stance, and give legitimacy to his statements on the comfort women, on his pro-war ideas, and his denial of the Nanjing Massacre.

> Since the publication of On War, everyone has misunderstood my intentions, and it's because the Marxists, anti-nationalists, and the left wing media pundits have all been saying the same thing: "He glamorizes (美化, bika) war!" I have praised the display of bravery shown by young soldiers who were protecting their motherland. There was no glamour in these memories of war… the left hasn't noticed that the very words they can use to speak about the war are dying out… They don't understand that once these words are gone, they will have no way of speaking to the young about the war. Still as ever, the words they use to label me are the same, "Right wing conservative, Militarist." Even the Chinese media has taken to criticizing me repeatedly for being a militarist…The best part, though, is that I heard from a Taiwanese newspaper that a group of manga artists in mainland China have come together with plans to train a group of anti-Kobayashi artists. What? they think they can create a red-Kobayashi Yoshinori to oppose my books *On War*, and *On Taiwan*? The thing is, these books weren't written with a nationalist strategy in mind. The state has never offered to pay for one pen or page of my manuscripts. I strive after the possibility of living an anti-government (反政府、hanseifu), and anti-establishment (反体制, hantaisei) existence! Honestly, can Chinese

communism help me achieve this kind of existence?[148]

From this perspective that sees a necessity in keeping an anti-establishment perspective on all views especially those which protect a society's most deeply held values, Kobayashi's work in *On War* seems not only inevitable, but necessary. His objective to express those opinions that would stir up the most controversy and bring into play those ideas guarded by the strongest taboos seems well-served by this work. Considering the national and international outcry that it created, it also seems his greatest success. What better way, after all, to bring to light the left's strict adherence to ideology than to challenge its most deeply held values: freedom, democracy, equality, feminism, and human rights? What better topic to mobilize this anti-ideological strike, than Japan's involvement in World War II? The *On War* series seen from this perspective does not seem like the wholesale abandonment of his original spirit to maintain an anti-ideological stance on issues concerning Japanese society. On the contrary, *On War* seems the hyper-realized assertion of it.

Neither does it seem as though Kobayashi has abandoned his secondary project to give voice to the weak and voiceless. In letter after letter applauding him for his work in *On War*, fans describe how the series enabled them to breach a long held silence kept between their grandfathers who served in the war and themselves because of the generally held belief that those that served in the Japanese army were war criminals that participated in the mass murder and rape of civilians all over Asia. The following are just a sample of these letters Kobayashi received and published.

From a 16 year old female high school student

The tears came out. Because after reading this book, I wanted to

[148] Kobayashi, *On War 2*, 37-39.

apologize to my grandfather. What I mean to say is when I was in third grade an organization of lefties (サヨク) contributed war books to our library for what I now can see to be the goal of brainwashing children. At that time, I was truly scared of my grandfather. He was taken prisoner in Burma during the war, and I thought, "Well, of course he was, because he did bad things." Finally, I asked him, "Grandpa, did you kill people?" I remember he first gave me a look of sadness, then one of resignation. On reading this book, I want to say thank you to my grandfather. Also, for the sake of my grandfather, I would like to try and be proud of my nation.[149]

From 25 year old builder in Ishikawa:

You wrote on things my grandfather has spoken about, the part about the Chinese plain clothes military. "Grandpa, sorry," I apologized to him, because when I was in Junior High School and High School, I often said to him, "That's all a lie, you just killed people." At the time, his face would turn strangely sad. I used to think if he was going to make such a face, why did he go to war in the first place? But after reading your book, I was truly taken aback. It made me angry, sad, excited. It was great. The present day trend in dealing with this past is truly regrettable.[150]

From a 63 year old office worker in Yamagata Prefecture:

As a child who lost his father in the war, I found it unbearably vexing to

---

[149] Kobayashi, *The New Arrogantist Manifesto 6*, 116
[150] ibid 132

> think that my father was involved as an agent of a war of aggression. In your book, arguments were made for a positive interpretation of the war, including arguments for its legitimacy, and in reading your book a great burden was lifted from my chest. Thank you very much.[151]

Though one has to wonder if his tactic in opening the debate on Japan's past war crimes has not helped bury the memory of the atrocities committed by "Japan's forefathers" by assuaging their guilt through the glorification of their actions, one still has to admit that Kobayashi has, at the very least, opened a forum for discussion on a once taboo topic between children and their parents or grandparents, and the post-war generation and its past. He has given voice to a segment of the population that was powerless to speak in the face of "traditional left-wing" versions of history that offered few characterizations of Japanese soldiers who fought in the war beyond those depicted under the labels "murderer" and "war criminal." With the writing of *On War*, he has offered his "question mark" with regards to Japan's involvement in World War II and the beliefs that surround Japan's memory of what happened at that time in history.

---

[151] ibid 134

5. Kobayashi, The Manga Artist (漫画か)

In order to speak about Kobayashi as a manga artist, I think it is important that I say something about the medium in which he is working and some of the traditions that inform my encounter with him in this textual space.

From the beginning, manga images have been steeped in satire, caricature, and parody. The term itself which combines the Chinese character for picture, 画 (ga), and the character 漫 "which means 'involuntary' or 'in spite of oneself" with a secondary nuance of 'morally corrupt'"[152] has its earliest recorded usage dating back to the 1770's,[153] but the origin of its formal usage is most commonly associated with ukiyoe (浮世絵, pictures of the floating world) woodblock artist Hokusai Katsushika's fifteen volume series of prints first published in 1819. These "Hokusai Manga" used caricature to criticize the aristocratic and samurai class following the Tempō period (1830-1844).[154] Most histories of manga don't begin here, however, but trace the development of manga as far back as 607 CE to the caricature style pictorial depictions of "people, animals, and 'grossly exaggerated phalli'…found on the backs of planks in the ceiling" of Horyūji temple in Nara. This mischievous play with human and animal images is then linked genealogically to Bishop Toba's (1053-1140) caricature paintings of the 12th century. These *Animal Scrolls* show depictions of "caricatured beings such as frogs, hares, monkeys, and foxes engaging in everyday human activities, parodying the decadent

---

[152] Schodt, *Dreamland Japan*, 34.
[153] Kinsella, Sharon, *Adult Manga; Culture and Power in Contemporary Japanese Society* (Surrey, England : Curzon Press, 2000) 20.
[154] Ito, Kinko, " A History of Manga in the Context of Japanese Culture and Society," from *The Journal of Popular Culture,* Vol. 38, No. 3 (Blackwell Publishing, 2005) 460.

lifestyle of the Japanese upper class of the period."[155] Though at the time of their creation Toba's *Animal Scrolls* were only viewed by a handful of the aristocracy, they were given new life in the public sphere during the Hōei period (1704-1711) when they were distributed commercially in book form under the name of Toba-e (賭場絵, Toba pictures). As Kinko Ito describes, "the publication of *Tobae* books in Osaka marked the start of the commercialization of *manga* at the beginning of the eighteenth century. They were printed using woodblock and spread from Osaka to Kyoto, Nagoya, and then to Edo (today's Tokyo) during the Tokugawa period (1603-1867)."[156]

Next in this genealogical line came the kibyōshi or "yellow jacket books" which "flourished in the thirty one years between 1775 to 1806."[157] Like the literary comic forms that gained popularity in the An'ei Tenmei era (1772-1786) due to what is believed to be "the lax rule of Senior Councillor Tanuma Okitsuya (r. 1772-1789), who neglected to enforce the restraints placed on society during the Kyōhō Reforms"[158] – literary forms such as the *senryū* (川柳, satiric haiku), a 17 syllable comic haiku that "used humor, satire, and wit to comment on contemporary society and the human condition,"[159] the *kyō ka* (狂歌, "wild" comic waka or poem), *kyōshi* (狂詩, "wild" comic Chinese poetry), *kyō bun* (狂文, "wild" comic prose), *dangibon* (談義本, satiric sermons), the *kokkeibon* (滑稽本, books of humor), and *sharebon* (洒落本, books of wit and fashion) - the kibyōshi used a "wild" (狂, kyō) sense of satiric expression to communicate its sometimes didactic

---

[155] ibid 458
[156] ibid 459.
[157] Shirane, Haruo, ed., *Early Modern Japanese Literature; An Anthology 1600-1900*, trans. Haruo Shirane et al., (New York : Columbia University Press, 2002) 672.
[158] ibid 521.
[159] ibid 520.

message. These comic picture books, though originally growing "out of picture books for children" soon gained popularity as books containing "jokes, satires, and cartoons for adults."[160]

In the mid 19th Century Charles Wirgman would tap into this Japanese appreciation for satire and parody in pictorial representations and turn it into commercial success with the publication of the social satire magazine *Japan Punch*, "a comic magazine that poked fun at life in the port [in Yokohama where Wirgman resided] and caricatured its prominent residents."[161] Though Wirgman would bring his own "European" sense of satire and caricature to the magazine, having served as a correspondent for the *London Illustrated News* before coming to Japan, "the Japanese had little trouble understanding what political cartoons were all about"[162] because of an already well-established history of enjoying art that poked fun at the elites and status symbols of society. As Kinko Ito observes, "the term ponchi (stemming from the English word 'punch') began to refer to what we call manga today. Words such as *Tobae*, *Otsue*, and *Kyōga* ('crazy pictures'), all of which referred to caricature and witty pictures, were replaced by the term manga."[163]

As with all histories, the above history of the development of the manga form has its critics. Sharon Kinsella, in her work *Adult Manga*, attaches her critical question mark to this understanding of Manga's development, stating,

> The impressive spectrum of graphic styles and genres which comprise the manga medium emerged only after the Pacific war, and most in the briefer

---

[160] Ito, "A History of Manga...," 459.
[161] Duus, "Presidential Address: Weapons of the Weak, Weapons of the Strong – The Development of the Japanese Political Cartoon," from *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 60, No. 4, (Nov., 2001) 968.
[162] ibid
[163] Ito, "A History of Manga...," 461.

> period since 1960. Nevertheless, the majority of cultural criticism has so far associated manga not with the international phenomenon of popular culture, but with far earlier forms of Japanese graphic art. Manga art has been compared repeatedly to the twelfth century illustrations of Bishop Toba (Toba-e), or the wood block print (ukiyoe) culture of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries…The opposition to the manga and animation industries by conservative elements in post-war society has encouraged the defenders of manga, namely professional manga critics, to emphasize or even invent stylistic origins for manga in ancient Japanese history. Its critics have hoped that if they could prove that manga is, somehow, a part of traditional Japan, then it cannot possibly be uprooted and repressed by government. This defensive argument has drawn attention away from the fact that manga is a strikingly contemporary cultural phenomenon.[164]

Regardless of whether manga finds its roots in 12th Century caricature or in the post-war period, one thing remains unquestioned: its foundational basis in satire, parody, and caricature. As Kinko Ito states, "one of the most important functions of Japanese manga in its long history is satire."

Frederik Schodt characterizes Kobayashi Yoshinori's move to using manga as a medium of expression for his political views as unique in the form, stating

> Political and social satire cartoons – of the sort that grace the editorial pages in European and American newspapers – have tended to be rather insipid and uninspired in Japan. Pre- and immediately post-war censorship is partly to blame. Kobayashi, using the longer manga format,

[164] Kinsella, *Adult Manga*, 20.

> is one of the first Japanese artists to deliver the punch of American or European political cartoonists in a Japanese context.[165]

In fact, political commentary and social satire did not vanish following post-war censorship, but actually flourished in the 60's. As Sharon Kinsella notes, "during the late 60's commercial publishers sought to include political and social themes in their manga. By introducing *gekiga* (artistic comics) into commercial weekly magazines and encouraging artists to draw politically anti-establishment manga stories, the editors of *Magazine* became the talking point of the Japanese media."[166]

With this history in mind, Kobayashi's work loses its radical edge as unique mode of expression and finds a home within a long tradition of social and political satire. Even Kobayashi's characterization of his alter-ego as a crazed uber-arrogantist loses its novelty when Japan's long literary history is taken into account. This particular tactic of embodying a "mad" personality to express dissatisfaction with the social status quo has precedents going as far back as the eighteenth century with the writings of the kyōsha (狂者, mad person). Haruo Shirane writes, "Not only did the 'mad person' criticize and mock the society that deprived the individual of opportunity and freedom, but he also criticized and laughed at himself. This persona has a long history in Japan, going back to the notion of the fūkyō (wild poetry) of the Buddhist and Confucian traditions…In the latter half of the eighteenth century, samurai intellectuals who considered themselves 'mad' turned not to the elegant forms of expression advocated by the Sorai school but to a comic, antiestablishment form, that of kyōbun (mad or comic Chinese prose) and kyō

---

[165] Schodt, *Dreamland Japan*, 225
[166] Kinsella, Adult Manga, 32.

shi (mad or comic Chinese poetry)..."[167] In the territory of signs colonized by manga tropes and genres, Kobayashi's work thus seems to take on a more mechanized appearance adhering to already well established practices of writing.

Thus, in light of the imperatives of the medium, I could say that it is equally reductive to paint Kobayashi's *On War* project uniformly with an anti-ideological, looking-out-for-the-little-man brush. Looking at his depiction of the naive and shallow left, the images he uses - faces imbedded with twinkling eyes, expressions frozen in the benign smile of a brainwashed believer (see figure 7) - have been emptied of any possibility to indicate the existence of a complex interweaving of motivations or intentions and are replaced by the uniform, surface substance of caricature.[168] (This is not to mention his vague use of the term "lefty" which seems to imply anyone believing in democracy, human rights, freedom, Marxism, or feminism; ironically this would mean an inclusion of his name under the banner of "lefty," since part of his anti-ideological stance is aimed at preserving the right to "freedom" of expression). In using caricatures to represent the liberal left, Kobayashi provides the visual ground for writing himself as the more complicated embodiment of opposition to the superficial reasoning of these starry eyed liberals. He will be the villain to their cloying idealism. And though his arguments may come off equally as superficial as the banal platitudes they launch to defend their peace-loving perspective on the world, underneath his entire project lies a counter-current of self-critical awareness that bubbles to the surface infrequently to act as momentary rupture to this clash on the surface. As shown above, Kobayashi is not

---

[167] Shirane, *Early Modern Japanese Literature*, 532-533.

[168] It is in contrast to these disparaging depictions of the anti-war left that Ishiyama Hisao writes a much broader and better researched history of successes achieved by the anti-war movement in his paper mentioned above, "Can we Yield Our Future to On War?" In Obinata, *Are You Willing to Die for your Country*, 147-187.

interested in providing sound arguments to prove himself right.[169] His is a project to question the possibility of maintaining a righteous stance on any issue. In fact it is this very contradictory nature of his work that has drawn so many readers.

As Schodt writes,

> Impassioned in expressing his personal beliefs (calling himself an "arrogant-ist" for doing so), he nonetheless always maintains a sense of humour and allows readers to laugh at his inconsistencies…In the Japanese context what he is doing is not only controversial, but "arrogant," because he draws so much attention to himself (hence the title). But this only makes him more interesting. The fact that Kobayashi draws and writes in the tongue-in-cheek, anarchist style of children's gag manga helps keep his excesses funny. Like the little boy who pointed out that the emperor wore no clothes, his boldness is offset by his innocence and honesty. His mission, however, is radical – to destroy intellectual complacency and narrow-mindedness.[170]

Unfortunately, having spent so long writing within the realm of manga, Kobayashi's control over this play of surfaces is inconsistent, as he seems easily drawn in by the appeal of writing according to genre, caricature, and dramatic overture. The imperative of the dramatic arc of his stories seems to push his arguments beyond the confines of mere speculation and critical inquiry into something resembling ideologically driven propaganda. Kobayashi lets the arc of the heroic tale take control of the histories

---

[169] See quotes on page 106 above.

[170] Schodt, *Dreamland Japan*, 225-228. This example of glowing praise for Kobayashi's work is the only one of its kind in an English text. The fact that these words were written before Kobayashi began his attack on the comfort women and before the publication of the *On War* volumes might give some explanation as to why Schodt did not feel compelled to restrain his plaudits for Kobayashi's work.

he writes, and his Japanese soldiers are turned into the noble protagonists of a dramatic tale of war. In the latter half of the first volume, Kobayashi devotes over sixty pages to the heroic war story of army officer Takamura Takehito. Kobayashi includes in his depiction of war all the elements of the classic heroic tale, beginning with descriptions of Takamura's idealized childhood and his dreams of becoming a soldier. Following the advice of his father, Takamura studies diligently to pass the entrance exams to enter military school and after two years of effort succeeds in gaining entrance. Following his years of training both mind and body for battle, Takamura graduates from military school and enlists to fight in the war. Kobayashi follows Takamura through one successful campaign after another, saving fellow soldiers trapped by enemy fire, rescuing young Japanese women from an abandoned outpost, blasting down an enemy supply train, all drawn in images taken from action hero and war story manga. Takamura is shown in one scene pinned down by machine gun fire, gritting his teeth with resolve as he prepares himself for a charge into certain death. "It would be a lie to say I wasn't scared," Takamura narrates, "But at the time only these few words floated in my head: I am the commander!"[171] (see figure 8) Takamura is then shown leading the charge into enemy fire, only to be rescued "by the grace of God" (天佑、tenyū) by the main force of the Japanese military in the area who show up in the nick of time. Following a harrowing but successful battle, Takamura is shown looking over the battle field in standard heroic post-battle pose: tired and dirty, but with a look of determination on his face as he holds in hand the symbol of his heroic legacy: the sword of a samurai.

Not only is Kobayashi drawn in by the allure of a good heroic war story, he also

---

[171] Kobayashi, *On War*, 240.

can't help but fall victim to the appeal of his caricatures - the starry eyed idealist, the pulpit pounding ideologue, the sinister, yet compelling villain - and forgets that these were just a play on the surface meant to trouble ideology and not create a new one. Yet, Kobayashi's main mistake is not just in falling victim to the draw of these tropes. After all, he is not alone in believing Japan's involvement in the Second World War was heroic. From a particular perspective, according to a partial view of the history of the war and a particular way of organizing facts, it could be said Japan's road to war was paved with good intentions. Kobayashi Yoshinori is not the first to argue this or many of his other contentious points concerning the representation of crimes committed by Japan during the war. The Japanese government's project to create the Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere to free East Asia from colonialism can boast support, not just from ultra-nationalist militarist, but also from such respected Japanese intellectuals as Nishida Kiitarō.[172] Kobayashi's notions of sacrificing the self for the sake of the country are not novel, for "this theme of honorable self sacrifice in group loyalty is of course a commonplace one in Japanese literature – in the Tale of the Heike, the Gikeiki, the samurai tales and codes of the Muromachi and Tokugawa periods…"[173] With regards to Kobayashi's subordination of the individual to the Japanese nation state, he is preceded by Hajime Tanabe who, "modifies his absolutization of the state or nation on the ground that the state, too, has the same radical evil as in the case of an individual person… for

---

[172]In "Fundamental Principles of a New World Order" Nishida writes, "In the past, because of the imperialism of the European peoples, the East Asian peoples have been oppressed, their nations have been colonized, and their own world-historical missions have been wrested from them. Now the various peoples of East Asia must awaken to their own world-historical mission as East Asian peoples; they must all transcend themselves and construct their own distinct world, thereby achieving their own world-historical mission as East Asian peoples. The is the basic principle of the construction of an East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. In *Sourcebook for Modern Japanese Philosophy; Selected Documents*, translated and edited by David A. Dilworth, Valdo H.Viglielmo, and Agustin Jacinto Zavala, (Westport : Greenwood Press, 1998). 74.

[173] ibid 229

God does not act directly upon the individual but the salvation of individuals is accomplished only through the mediation of the nation and society that already exists as a community of individuals."[174] Kobayashi's declaration that the Tokyo War Crimes Trials were a sham is hardly unprecedented. Those like Indian Justice Radhabinod Pal who presided over the trials, and General MacArthur's chief of counter-intelligence during the occupation of Japan, General Charles Willoughby, were some of the first to declare the trials a hoax. "This trial," General Willoughby is quoted as saying, "was the worst hypocrisy in recorded history."[175]

Kobayashi's main mistake is in believing that the location of the negational standpoint - that of anti-ideologue criticizing liberal ideology - is an empty space free of its own dependence on ideological devices. His ideology, however, does not function according to the rationale of the arguments that he makes. If we are to take Kobayashi's statement on righteousness to heart, then his statements are only meant to be read as a manner of speaking. Kobayashi's fascism, then, is not a function of an ideological presence. It could even be argued that his assumption of the fascist role in his magazine is also merely a manner of speaking. This fascism, however, regardless of its figurative or literal implications, becomes a kind of ideological production by virtue of that which is not even taken into consideration. In the world of Kobayashi's partiality, the shift required in the ordering of his histories to make his stories come to life comes at the cost of the expulsion of life as disregarded waste. Like the parodies Kobayashi wrote while

---

[174] Citation of Ozaki Makoto's interpretation of Tanabe's work taken from *Sourcebook for Modern Japanese Philosophy*, 102.

[175] Dower, John W., *Embracing Defeat; Japan in the Wake of World War II* (New York : W. W. Norton & Company, 1999) 451. Dower further reinforces this general air of discontent over the trials stating, "By 1948, hardly anyone was left who still believed that Nuremberg and Tokyo could provide the basis for a peaceful world grounded in a new order of international law and justice." 453.

working in children's manga, Kobayashi's histories of the war and his depictions of contemporary Japanese society are purely conceptual and as such devoid of life. Unfortunately, because he is no longer working in fiction, but dealing with real histories of people who lived, his conceptual play has a more devastating impact within the realm of the real.

As admittedly partial and biased, Kobayashi needs to make concessions about the limits of his ability to process the material he deals with and the ideas he produces. Writing in reply to Uesugi's accusations that his spirit as a manga writer has died, Kobayashi has this to say:

> It goes without saying I'm a manga artist. Though I've poked my nose into the field of theory and debate, my main role is as a manga artist, and I try to preserve my roots in manga when I write. So, as a manga artist, there are things I may say that are wrong, and I will be inclined to attack ideas according to a particular point of view. It's possible that I could have expressed my intentions differently without relying on my sometimes inadequate sometimes excessive manner of speaking. That being said, I've grown to ignore the criticisms that I receive. Even today, I look over the mountain of letters I receive from readers, and I believe that I should humbly try to listen to what they have to say whatever nameless voice I encounter. Even now, I don't intend to change this.[176]

Kobayashi writes himself first and foremost as a manga writer admitting his world and his work will be framed according to the constraints that are inherent to writing in this

---

[176] Kobayashi Yoshinori 小林よしのり and Izawa Motohiko 井沢元彦, *Asahi Shimbun no Seigi 朝日新聞の正義 (The Asahi Newspaper's Sensè of Right)* (Tokyo Shōgakukan Paperbacks 小学館文庫, 1999) 10.

medium.

In *On Post-Righteousness* there is a telling moment when the repercussions of this kind of admission in how Kobayashi frames the world are made evident. Yoshirin narrates the story of his participation in a round table discussion about Japan's Ministry of Health and Welfare's treatment of the HIV scandal. He singles out a comment made by round table discussant Nishibe Susumu who speculates on what his reaction would have been had he been one of the parents of the children who had been injected with the tainted blood. Nishibe is shown very calmly stating that if it were his own daughter he would have been angry enough to consider "bringing down the Ministry with something like a bazooka."[177] Yoshirin, struck by Nishibe's words, is shown seriously contemplating this idea of violence, "Bring down the Ministry with a bazooka....That could work too... It would make for quite a dramatic picture."[178] Here, Kobayashi provides the confounding depiction of himself as a caricature of the consummate manga writer constantly turning suggestions made in reality into images on the pages of his imagination. Kobayashi reveals himself as only able to understand the world through the mediation of dramatized manga images, and the reader is left to imagine what kind of story Kobayashi has fabricated in his head: a father, face contorted in a caricature of grief and rage over the loss of his daughter, charging down on the Ministry with a bazooka strapped to his shoulder. Blam! Debris, bodies, and Kobayashi's point made in his characteristic over-the-top fashion. Meanwhile, lost somewhere in the rubble are the real intricacies of a less dramatic, more complicated grief felt by a father faced with the loss of a child. Here Kobayashi's inclination towards dramatization with the purpose of

---

[177] *On Post-Righteousness*, 44
[178] ibid 45

keeping his readers engaged and entertained - he is a manga writer, not a historian or documentary director - seems to jar when the delicacy of another person's experience of grief, loss, or suffering is what is being represented. Kobayashi makes the mistake in thinking the devices that brought him fame in the realm of children's manga could be applied with equal enthusiasm to the lives of people.

As an anti-ideologue, he proves his keenness in spotting the flaws in logic of arguments opposing his position. He knows well enough to keep his own sense of "righteousness" marked with a question mark. Yet, as a manga writer, this keenness is dulled by the demands of a medium that he believes offers him a limited number of expressive devices on which he can draw. He is restricted by his own partial understanding of how manga functions to such an extent that the medium seems to dictate the logic of his message.

In his treatment of the comfort women's claims against the Japanese government, Kobayashi, according to the anti-ideological mandate of the Manifesto series, offers alternative explanations for how the comfort women could have been enticed into becoming prostitutes - they were poor and needed the money, their parents sold them to the brothels, they were enticed not by the military, but by the owners of the brothels themselves. Opening the issue up to multiple interpretations, Kobayashi manages to corrupt standard perceptions of the issue that would place the Japanese government and military on the side of evil villain/abductor/rapist while the comfort women remain written uniformly as innocent victims of a vicious, organized crime. Kobayashi further argues that there are no documents available which undeniably prove the Japanese government gave direct orders to forcefully abduct women to be used for sexual sport by

the military. In this, he is right. The history of the comfort women is a complicated affair, one that was further complicated by the burning of documents by Japanese officials following Japan's declaration of surrender. It is doubtful that any historian could prove that all people involved, victims and victimizers, were uniformly motivated. I don't think it a mistake for Kobayashi to question the validity of evidence and testimonies given by former comfort women concerning the Japanese governments implication in creating and maintaining the comfort stations all over Asia. I don't think it a mistake for him to question why some segments of the Japanese population seem willing to accept these accounts of atrocities committed by its own government unquestioningly. His fault is not in asking the question, but is in the manner and means by which he frames the question.

Having spent the better part of his life working in a style of manga writing that favored gags and caricatures over depth of character and story, Kobayashi seems hard pressed to lift himself out of this favored mode of writing. This is not to say that the medium itself is restricted to the devices he puts to use. Art Spiegleman, Robert Crum working in comics, and Mizuki Shigeru, and Ishinomori Shōtarō working in manga are just a sample of the artists that have provided plenty of examples of characters whose identities went well beyond the interplay of a few general features and stories that wove their tale with a complexity that breached the boundaries of genre.[179] Kobayashi, in

[179] Art Spiegelman's two volume graphic novel *Maus* (New York : Pantheon Books, 1973) provides an interesting alternative to Kobayashi's *On War* series. Where Kobayashi uses drama and parody to drum his points into the heads of his readers, Spiegelman, writing on the history of the Holocaust in Germany, manages to balance his awareness of the problem of representing atrocity via a comic medium with historical accounts and auto-biography to offer a more nuanced and complex approach to dealing with the problems inherent to remembering war and atrocity. A comparison of the two would be interesting, but unfortunately is outside of my realm of inquiry. In Japanese manga, Mizuki Shigeru has provided his own semi-autobiographical account of the absurdity of war in several of his war manga including *The Banzai Charge*, (Sōin Gyokusai Seyo, 総員玉砕せよ). Miyazaki Tetsuya offers a comparative analysis between

contrast, is not known for his subtlety or depth of character development. His characters are uniformly designed according to use and function. Obotchamakun, Jet Boy, Yukie and Shinya, are not deeply nuanced characters. In a writing style that depends on sight gags, scatological humor, and word plays, there is very little room for character development. *Brute Love* would not work as a parody if Yukie and Shinya were given any depth. As long as Yukie is read as a spoof of a type of character and not seen as a person in her own right, the image of a sickle protruding from her forehead can be seen as funny. The moment she is invested with any life is the moment we begin to question the sense of value that finds humor in this kind of garish violence.

Granted, Kobayashi's palette has broadened somewhat since his days as a children's manga artist. He has learned to politicize his images for effect. He has developed new stylistic devices to give his work a broader appeal over a wide range of readers. Unfortunately he has done little to deepen his ability to communicate human motivation beyond the one or two note features of caricature. In his depiction of the AIDS scandal, characters are divided according to type: naive university students, evil Ministry workers, plotting labor movement members, and innocent child victims. Even his depictions of his alter ego, Yoshirin, have changed little or deepened any since his introduction in the first issue fourteen years ago. Still wearing the same black top, still sporting the same round glasses, and not having aged a day, Yoshirin performs his functions with the same limited range of emotional expression: skeptical inquisitiveness,

---

Charge, (Sōin Gyokusai Seyo, 総員玉砕せよ). Miyazaki Tetsuya offers a comparative analysis between Kobayashi's heroic depictions of war versus Mizuki's less idealized approach in "The Rejection of Logic that Gives Meaning to Life through the Significance of Death in Mizuki's Manga" 水木漫画で否定されていたロギック「意義ある死こそ生を意味つける」(Mizuki Manga de Hitei Sareteita Rojikku "Igi Aru Shi Koso Iki wo Imi Tsukeru"), in *Ronza* (Vol. 12, 1998), 205-209. Ishinomori Shōtaro 石の森章太郎 uses science fiction to ask complex questions of what it means to be human when he writes the tale of a robot struggling with questions of morality when its "conscience chip" is removed in the manga *Artificial Human Machine* (Jinzō Ningen Kikaida, 人造人間キカイダ), (Tokyo : Akita Publishers 秋田書店, 2000).

arrogant self-righteousness, and sheepish self deprecation.

Bringing his shallow, functional understanding of human character to the debate on the legitimacy of the comfort women, Kobayashi imbues the issue with a double motion; he invests the issue with new intensity by drawing attention to alternative possible interpretations of the events while at the same time shutting down the possibility of extending these alternatives beyond the parameters within which he has allowed interpretation to function. Though Kobayashi introduces alternate stories of the comfort women's recruitment that counter the standard belief that they were all forcefully abducted into sexual service, and by doing so introducing the possibilities for a more complicated understanding of this history, he shuts down the territory on which the debate can function by relying on only a few set roles to which the women involved can embody. Thus his version of history becomes like an inverted reproduction of what would normally be thought to be the fascist project to rewrite history; instead of founding this project on a desire to homogenize history so it can be assimilated to a greater project of nationalism, Kobayashi rewrites history to inject the possibility of a rupture of a believed uniformity in order to dismantle what he (and fellow members of the Society for History Textbook Reform) believes to be a masochistic Japanese history that fosters self-loathing. In reaction to the "common sense" notion held by the liberal left that the comfort women were wholly victimized, he argues for the possibility that they were not victims, but willing participants, in order to introduce his question mark into ideologically driven histories and notions of "right." At the same time, the partial nature of his subjective point of view that is further filtered by the medium in which he works shuts down the number of possibilities to which this rupture can direct itself. In

Kobayashi's manga world, humans appear according to type, and are underwritten by their conceptual function in this world. The comfort women torn from their reference to a complex reality are assimilated into functional roles to serve Kobayashi's project to rupture history. He writes them as though they were characters in a story: the daughters of poor families choosing a life of prostitution because of a need for money, the consumer item sold by poor parents into prostitution to pay for other necessities, or the playgirl looking for a fun way to make a quick buck. The government and military didn't force them kicking and screaming from their homes. They were willing whores, and the ones now complaining of their ill treatment are mere opportunists again looking for an easy way to make some money off the government. In order to provide a counter/heroic type to his notion of the willing whore, Kobayashi offers the image of the virginal victim who is too modest to speak of her violation. This heroic type is, unsurprisingly, written into the body of the ideal *Japanese* woman.

> There is a history of cruelty towards Japanese women as well. In Manchuria, when the Russian army attacked, Japanese women were violated by the Russian soldiers in front of their husbands and families. It was a picture of hell on earth. At that time, women who became pregnant as a result killed themselves. Others who managed to make it back to Hakata city in Japan went to a shelter and had abortions done. However, these Japanese women ever afterwards kept their mouths clammed shut on the incident, never uttering a word of what happened. They kept their stories hidden in their hearts, so this truth vanished as though it never existed. Japanese women are wonderful. I look proudly on such Japanese

women."[180]

The confounding question as to how he would have been able to write about a history whose "truth" had "vanished" aside, this counter story to that of the comfort women reveals Kobayashi's inability to see and represent a kind of woman that doesn't fit to type. His histories are either the inflammatory story of the willing whore crying "Rape!" to get more money or the tragic story of modest virgins being raped by foreign monsters, and nobly refusing to tell the tale because of their inherently modest nature. Neither version of history offers the possibility of describing people whose motivations were more complex than would fit the narrow confines of a comic book story.

Furthermore, by focusing on only dramatic notions of the events that took place which would either have the Japanese government giving direct orders to its military to drag women kicking and screaming from their homes or not,[181] Kobayashi makes himself blind to the subtler play of power implicit to implied orders, and indirect coercion that could be just as violent in their results on these women. According to his manga mentality where direct actions mark who is the villain and who is the hero, the more sinister and dangerous neutrality of an order that sends military officers out to poverty stricken areas to fill set quotas of girls to be recruited for the comfort stations, or the belligerence of a government that offers incentives to already established brothel owners to increase the number of military clientele to whom it can cater become invisible to his

---

[180]Kobayashi, *The New Arrogantist Manifesto* 3, 21.

[181] In this (as well as elsewhere) Kobayashi's arguments are similar to those of Holocaust deniers who declare the Holocaust never took place because there is no evidence proving Hitler gave the order to obliterate European Jews. In reaction to this Walter Laqueur has astutely observed, "It is also true that no general order signed by Hitler referring to the destruction of European Jewry has ever been found. But this did not come as a great surprise to historians, who know that throughout history the greater the crime, the less is the likelihood that written evidence will ever be found." From *Fascism; Past, Present, and Future* (Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1996) 139.

eye.[182] He does not seem able to see the horror in an offhand order to prey on the misfortunes of women locked in poverty with few alternatives, because Kobayashi cannot see women. His habits of representing women as caricature to appeal to young male audiences has made him incapable of drawing women merely-as-such, not as sex objects, whores, virgins, pornographic images, or victims. But just as people.

This inability to see and represent people beyond their functional roles is not restricted to women in *On War*. All his characters act according to function. All his stereotypes work towards enforcing ruptures in ideology, or corrupting the uniform ground of history. As a historical revisionist, Kobayashi depends on the repetition of common historical tropes to reinvest them with new intensities through which the new generation can access a history of difference. Unfortunately, Kobayashi spends so much of his effort and ink playing to genres and types there is little room left for the complications of a living being. Instead of writing his manga over the territory of the real in which life subsists, he has inverted the relationship between this real and the virtual world of manga, so that the logic of the virtual becomes his basis for judgments made in and on the real world.

This is best exemplified in an argument he makes in the opening pages of the first *On War* volume concerning the use of death by left wing idealists to justify their anti-war stance. Yoshirin is shown marching with the glee of a boy on Christmas against a backdrop of tanks, jets, and military weapons. "According to the childlike sentiments of a young boy," he writes, "Japan's war in Asia was great!" (see figure 9) In the next

---

[182] 吉見義明 Yoshiaki Yoshimi's work on the comfort women provides this more in-depth interpretation of the Japanese governments involvement in the systematic rape of women all over East Asia. He, along with colleague Kawada Fumiko 川田文子, specifically single out Kobayashi's work for criticism in 「*従軍慰安婦」をめぐる３０のウソと真実、Jūgun Ianfu wo Meguru 30 no Uso to Shinjitsu, Thirty Truths and Lies Told about the Military Comfort Women.* (大月書店, Ootsuki Publishing, 1997).

frame he offers his justification for a pro-war stance that ignores the cost of life implicit to a pro-war ideology.

> "A lot of casualties came out of that war, you know," some sentimentalists might retort angrily. But that's like getting upset at a boy who says "Cool!" when he sees Ultra man fight a monster, and yelling at him, "A lot of casualties are under that rubble of those buildings he destroyed, you know!" They are just hypocrites spouting pleasant platitudes.[183]

It seems apparent from this segment that Kobayashi does not distinguish the difference between real victimization resulting from a war, and the simulated victimization of an anime TV program. The fact that the two are different in that actual lives were lost in the former and none in the latter seems to escape him. Unfortunately, it is a blindness that pervades the entire series.

When Kobayashi draws his manga perspective to the atrocities committed in Nanjing, the bombings of Hiroshima, or the tragedy of the suicide pilots, his manga reality takes over, colonizing each argument with its cartoon understanding of human motivation and cause and effect. In the world of manga it is easy to write counter histories to the troubling real histories already in existence. The Chinese can be villainized as liars, conspirators, and murderers willing to kill their own people to frame the Japanese military, because in this world logic requires there be a villain. Like the simulated victims trapped in the rubble of destruction in an Ultraman episode, their deaths are of little import, because there was no life there in the first place.

Unfortunately, because Kobayashi is addressing mainly a segment of the Japanese population who grew up reading manga and watching Ultraman, his logic is familiar.

---

[183] Kobayashi, *On War*, 29.

Kobayashi alters the basis by which his readers enter into their encounter of the histories with which he deals by grafting their repetition through the simultaneous repetition of manga tropes and discourses. In doing so, he manages to take control over the governance of emotions that come as a result of his writing. By colonizing the Nanjing massacre with a hero/villain logic of productive meaning, Kobayashi can manipulate the emotions that emerge at the moment of rupture in the story. When the reader is forced to see that the Nanjing Massacre was staged by the Chinese and Western powers, this disjuncture with already encountered histories creates the production of an emotional reaction. By forcing a break in the perceived understanding of history, Kobayashi makes the reader feel as though he were cheated, victimized by a conspiracy of foreign powers, lied to by Japanese co-conspirators. Kobayashi then takes this emotion and makes it adhere to the only signifiers he makes available: foreign faces, women, and the liberal left. Though Kobayashi may have originally intended to offer this history as mere rupture to the dominant history learned in schools, the manga form through which he writes enforces a mobilization of emotions that turns rupture and difference into a new form of uniformity - the uniform hate and distrust for things "not-Japanese," and "not-male." Evidence of this is given voice in the letters he receives from fans who express their newfound distrust of the world outside Japan. These voices are the legacy Kobayashi leaves behind, a legacy pervaded by nationalist outrage while lacking in sympathy.

> Letter from a 17 year old high school student
>
> I was overwhelmed with anger. I want to thump the shallow, naive left, and the Americans, and the Chinese with my anger, but because I'm only

a high school student, I have no power to express my anger so it can be heard. When I am an adult, if this problem still remains, I think I'll find some kind of job or develop ideas that will help me find the means to yell, 'You idiots! Can't you see you're wrong!' and make my voice heard by the public, and make these ideas stick.[184]

[184] Kobayashi, *The New Arrogantist Manifesto 6*, 113.

A Few Last Words

In splitting Kobayashi's "persona" into the above three major fragments (fascist, rebel, and manga writer), I have tried present a particular experience of Kobayashi's work that I encounter every time I open the pages of the volumes in his *Manifesto* series, especially those of *On War*. This reading of his work was not one that I initially experienced on first looking at *On War*, but came after several readings informed by several different understandings of what was at stake in his work. It is an experience I had to train myself to encounter.

At the start, I read *On War* with the predetermined idea that he was a fascist, and after finishing it through once, I felt this label seemed an appropriate fit. As I have shown above, his work teems with fascist overtones. In two conferences at which I presented papers dealing with Kobayashi as a fascist, I was approached afterwards by professors who asked if I had taken into account the role the medium played in his work. One professor suggested that maybe I was taking him too seriously as a fascist, and less seriously as a writer working in a popular vernacular with specific traditions. Manga and anime, I was informed, were written with a particular sense of lightness to them. Parody, satire, irony, humour were the predominant modes of expression. How would this change my interpretation were I to take this into account? I found these comments compelling and returned to *On War* with a new notion of Kobayashi around which I could organize my interpretation. I began reading him in light of my new understanding, and an entirely different Kobayashi was revealed to me. This was the Kobayashi as quintessential manga artist who was more interested in playing with parody and caricature then he was with making bold political statements. I began reading his earlier

work in children's manga, with *Obotchamakun*, and *Listen up*! and *Brute Love*, and discovered a mode of expression very much keyed towards playing with surfaces and forcing disruptions in genres via parody. Taking this idea of Kobayashi as shameless parodist and entertainer and applying it to his versions of history, I encountered a work that took on an otherly quality imbued with a lightness to its process of signification. Historical events became his juggling balls in a jester's act aimed at stirring emotion, gaining attention, making his readers laugh. As he himself states, "my work will always be interesting, peculiar, and enjoyable. If I happen to put together a sound argument, then so be it."[185] Something, however, left me feeling ill at ease with this interpretation. Had he been working with a different history, one that didn't require the objectification of mass suffering to entertain, I may have left his work satisfied that he was engaged in a mere play of surfaces. Not to be taken seriously. But the material he was working with and the effects of his work in the public sphere both nationally and internationally were not something I could so easily discard as play. If he was interested in play why not stick to children's manga, or comment on less contentious issues?

I began to take notice of some of the meta-critical commentaries he made both inside and outside his work in *On War*, and looked at earlier issues of the Manifesto series in search of an answer as to "Why these issues?" and "Why now?" What resulted was yet another Kobayashi emerging in his texts. This was the Kobayashi as anti-ideological rebel. This was the Kobayashi that had his hand on the pulse of the nation and knew what buttons to push to stir debate. This was the Kobayashi who was determined to say the things that no one else would say in Japan, but not just state them,

---

[185] Kobayashi, *The Arrogantist Manifesto 2*, 8.

declare them at the top of his voice, with arrogance and panache: "Gōman Kamashite Yoka desuka?!"

Yet, now I had three Kobayashi's cycling through the text and though each one seemed to share common features with the other, each one seemed able to function independently, and Kobayashi was not helpful in unifying them, but seemed quite content to speak out of all sides of his mouth. With all these Kobayashis circulating through his texts I found it no longer possible to pigeon-hole his work as simply one thing or another. In trying to reconcile all of them in my readings something kept obstructing me from pulling them altogether under one comprehensive umbrella of signification. It didn't take me long to realize what was getting in the way.

I was.

I noticed in my readings of his work that I was continually trying to homogenize the substance of his ideas, so that I could pull out some harmonic device on which I would be able to focus my thesis. I was driven by the imperative of the form of my writing – the thetic-based paper – to fit Kobayashi's texts to a chosen function in my own text. In essence, my actions in subordinating the possible multiplicity of his work to the necessary uniformity of its function in my text mirrored the very actions I was criticizing. Reading commentaries on his work didn't help me resolve these problems because of the uniform manner with which his work was treated. I also noticed that in each encounter I had with him in my readings, either as fascist, nationalist, anti-ideological rebel, or compassionate hero for the masses, I found myself occupying a counter position that was necessarily opposed to whichever univocal feature with which I had infected his text. There seemed to be a micro-colony of logic waiting for me to occupy my position in

relation to the fascist, nationalist, manga artist, or parodist. Regardless of the positions I found myself occupying there was one overriding theme that strung them together. I was engaging in a strategic approach whose ultimate goal was aimed towards gaining the ability to speak in a decisive fashion on a topic that didn't abide to conclusive statements and unified theories. I, like the critics Kobayashi loved to lampoon, was mainly interested in proving myself right. Unfortunately, I realized the issue at stake wasn't one of right or wrong.

"But then," I had to ask myself, "what, in fact, is at stake?"

The answer was simple. Mere "life" was at stake, the mere life Agamben speaks of in his work *The Coming Community*, the mere life of people I have met who did not share my opinions or values. People like Kazuhiko. Mere life and the difficulty inherent to any encounter with that life that does not seek its subordination to predetermined principles or notions of a "proper" kind of life. With this is mind, the experience of Kobayashi's work in the last few pages was aimed, not at resolving the idea of his work into a conclusive whole, but to leave the reader with a sense of Kobayashi's work as something that asked questions of us, whether intentionally or not, that were more complex than merely, "Is he right?"

Because, as tempting as it is to label him as only a fascist, lunatic extremist or demagogue, Kobayashi's arguments do not speak in one voice. They are the arguments of a man occupying the site of a complex network of motivations and influences. He is a man of habit, a man of bias, a man capable of unleashing intensity. His perception of the world, as he himself admits, is partial. In engaging him as anything more than merely this – as the uniform voice of neo-nationalism – endangers the reproduction of the flaws

of his partiality by ignoring their productive capabilities. Yet at the same time, his work needs to be marked with the sign of danger because of what does not enter into the realm of his partial subjectivity: life written under the sign of the human figure.

Because, politically speaking, Kobayashi's texts only have meaning in their affect on how I deal with the people I encounter throughout my life, whether they be strangers, friends, or family, and any encounter is hard pressed to take place within the confines of a universe lacking in room for the mere appreciation of someone else; an appreciation that is possible if only we can learn to extend our sympathies, or our sim-pathies, beyond the limits of a proud belief in the infinite extent of our own ability to comprehend.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Kobayashi Yoshinori 小林よしのり。*Gōmanizumu Sengen Special; Sensōron ゴーマニズム宣言 Special ; 戦争論 (The Arrogantist Manifesto Special; On War).* Tokyo : Gentōsha 幻冬社. 1998.

___ *Gōmanizumu Sengen Special; Sensōron 2 ゴーマニズム宣言 Special ; 戦争論 2 (The Arrogantist Manifesto Special; On War, Volume 2).* Tokyo : Gentōsha 幻冬社,

___ *Gōmanizumu Sengen Special; Sensōron 3 ゴーマニズム宣言 Special ; 戦争論 3 (The Arrogantist Manifesto Special; On War, Volume 3).* Tokyo : Gentōsha 幻冬社, 2003.

Secondary Sources – Japanese

Arakawa Shōji 荒川章二. "Kako no Kyōben ni Suginu 'Monogatari' ni Dokusha wo Sasoikomu Shikake ni Takumisa" 過去の強弁にすぎぬ「物語」に読者を誘い込む仕掛けの巧みさ (The Ingenuity of Inviting Readers into a Story that offers Nothing more than an Inflexible Vision of the Past" from *Ronza: Kobayashi Yoshinori "Sensōron" Hihan 論座:小林よしのり『戦争論』批判 (The Seat of Debate: Criticism of Kobayashi Yoshinori's On War)* 44, (December, 1998), 193-197.

Kawamoto, Takashi 川本隆史. "'Chokkan to Rikutsu' ni Kinkō wo Toru Doryoku wo Hōki Shita Gōmanizumu no Hōhōteki Hatan" 「『直観と理屈』に均衡を取る努力を放棄したゴーマニズムの方法的破綻」 ("The Failure of a Method: Arrogantism's Abandoned Effort to Strike a Balance between 'Reason and Intuition'") from *Ronza: Kobayashi Yoshinori "Sensōron" Hihan 論座 : 小林よしのり『戦争論』批判 (The Seat of Debate: Criticism of Kobayashi Yoshinori's On War)* 44, (December, 1998): 198-203.

Kobayashi Yoshinori 小林よしのり. *Gōmanizumu Sengen 2 ゴーマニズム宣言 2(The Arrogantist Manifesto, Volume 2).* Tokyo : Gentōsha 幻冬舎, 1993.

___ *Ijō Tensai Zukan 異常天才図鑑 (The Illustrated Guide to Abnormal Genius).* Gentōsha Paperbacks 幻冬舎文庫, 1997.

___ *Shin Gōmanizumu Sengen 3 新ゴーマニズム宣言 1(The New Arrogantist Manifesto, Volume 3).* Tokyo : Shōgakukan 小学館, 1997.

___ *Gōmanizumu Sengen Supesharu; Sabetsuron ゴーマニズム宣言スペシャル ; 差別論 (The Arrogantist Manifesto Special; On Racism).* Tokyo : Gentōsha Paperbacks 幻冬舎文庫, 1998.

___ *Gōmanizumu Sengen 1* ゴーマニズム宣言 *1 (The Arrogantist Manifesto, Volume 1).* Tokyo : Gentōsha Paperbacks 幻冬舎文庫, 1999.

___ *Gōmanizumu Sengen 4* ゴーマニズム宣言 *4 (The Arrogantist Manifesto, Volume 4).* Tokyo : Gentōsha Paperbacks 幻冬舎文庫, 1999.

___ *Shin Gōmanizumu Sengen 6* 新ゴーマニズム宣言 *(The New Arrogantist Manifesto, Volume 6).* Tokyo : Shōgakukan 小学館, 1999.

___ *Shin Gōmanizumu Special; Datsuseigiron* 新ゴーマニズム*Special*脱正義論 *(The New Arrogantist Manifesto Special; On Post-Righteousness).* Tokyo : Shōgakukan小学館, 2000.

___ *Shin Gōmanizumu Special; Taiwanron* 新ゴーマニズム*Special*台湾論 *(The New Arrogantist Manifesto Special; On Taiwan).* Tokyo : Shōgakukan小学館, 2000.

___ *Wascism, Vol. 1.* Tokyo : Gentōsha 幻冬舎, 2002.

Kobayashi Yoshinori 小林よしのり、Izawa Motohiko 井沢元彦. *Asahi Shimbun no Seigi* 朝日新聞の正義 *(The Asahi Newspapers Sense of Right).* Tokyo : Shōgakukan 小学館, 1999.

Miyazaki Tetsuya 宮崎哲弥. Mizuki Manga de Hitei Sareteita Rojikku "Igi Aru Shi koso Iki wo Imi Dukeru" 水木漫画で否定されていたロジック「意義ある死こそ生を意味づける」("The Rejection of Logic that Gives Meaning to Life through the Significance of Death in Mizuki's Manga"), from *Ronza: Kobayashi Yoshinori "Sensōron" Hihan* 論座：小林よしのり『戦争論』批判 *(The Seat of Debate: Criticism of Kobayashi Yoshinori's On War)* 44, (December, 1998): 204-209.

Nishio Kanji 西尾幹二 et. al. Atarashii Rekishi Kyōkasho 新しい歴史教科書 (The New History Textbook). Tokyo : Fusōsha 扶桑社, 2001.

Obinata Sumio 大日方純夫 et. al. Kimitachi ha Sensō de Shineru ka; Kobayashi Yoshinori [Sensōron] Hihan 君たちは戦争で死ねるか；小林よしのり『戦争論』批判 (Are You Willing to Die for Your Country; Criticisms of Kobayashi Yoshinori's 'On War'). Tokyo : Ōtsuki Publishers 大月書店, 1999.

Uesugi Satoshi 上杉聰. *Datsu Gōmanizumu Sengen; Kobayashi Yoshinori no "Ianfu" Mondai* 脱ゴーマニズム宣言；小林よしのりの「慰安婦」問題 *(The Post-Arrogantist Manifesto; Kobayashi Yoshinori and the Comfort Women Issue).* Osaka : Tōhō Publishing 東方出版. 1997.

Yoshimi Yoshiaki 吉見義明, Kawata Fumiko, 川田文子, eds. [Jūgunianfu] wo Meguru 30 no Uso to Shinjitsu 『従軍慰安婦』をめぐる30のウソと真実 (30 Truths and Lies Told About the "Military Comfort Women"). Tokyo : Ōtsuki Publishers 大月書店, 1997.

Secondary Sources – English

Agamben, Giorgio. *The Coming Community*, trans. Michael Hardt. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Allardyce, Gilbert. "What Fascism is not: Thoughts on the Deflation of a Concept," *Fascism; Critical Concepts in Political Science, Volume One: the Nature of Fascism*, edited by Roger Griffin, and Matthew Feldman. New York : Routledge, 2004. 176-208.

Badiou, Alain. *Deleuze; The Clamor of Being*. Trans. Louise Burchill. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 2000.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Ithaca : Cornell University Press, 1989.

Bhabha, Homi K. "Of Mimicry and Men," *The Location of Culture*. New York : Routledge, 1994. 85-92.

Befu, Harumi. "Gift Giving in Japan," *Monumenta Nipponica*. 23:3/4, 1968. 445-456.

Clifford, Rebecca, "Cleansing History, Cleansing Japan: Kobayashi Yoshinori's Analects of War and Japan's Revisionist Revival," *Nissan Occasional Paper Series*, no. 35 (Nissan Institute of Japanese Studies: Oxford University). Available at the Nissan Institute's World Wide Web site at http://www.nissan.ox.ac.uk

de Certeau, Michel, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven F. Rendall. University of California Press, 1984.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Difference and Repetition*. Trans. Paul Patton. New York : Columbia University Press, 1994.

___ *Empiricism and Subjectivity; An Essay on Hume's Theory of Human Nature*. Trans. Constantin V. Boundas. New York : Columbia University Press, 1991.

___ *The Logic of Sense*. Edited by Constantin V. Boundas, trans. Mark Lester, and Charles Stivale. New York : Columbia University Press, 1990.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus; Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

___ *A Thousand Plateaus; Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

Derrida, Jacques. "The Time of the King," from *Given Time: I. Counterfeit Memory*, trans. Peggy Kamuf. Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1992. 1-33.

Dilworth, David A., Valdo H.Viglielmo, and Agustin Jacinto Zavala, eds, and trans. *Sourcebook for Modern Japanese Philosophy; Selected Documents*. Westport : Greenwood Press, 1998.

Dower, John W. *Embracing Defeat; Japan in the Wake of World War II*. New York : W. W. Norton & Company, 1999.

Duus, Peter. "Presidential Address: Weapons of the Weak, weapons of the Strong – The Development of the Japanese Political Cartoon," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 60:4, (Nov.2001), 965-997.

Duus, Peter, and Daniel I. Okimoto. "Comment: Fascism and the History of Pre-War Japan: The Failure of a Concept." *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 39:1, (Nov. 1979) 65-76.

Eatwell, Roger. "Towards New Model of Generic Fascism," *Fascism; Critical Concepts in Political Science, Volume One: the Nature of Fascism*, edited by Roger Griffin, and Matthew Feldman. New York : Routledge, 2004. 221-254.

Hanneman, Mary L. "Dissent form Within; Hasegawa Nyozekan, Liberal Critic of Fascism," *Monumenta Nipponica*. 52:1, Spring,1997. 38-58.

Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Trans. Joan Stambaugh. Albany : State University of New York Press, 1996.

Ito, Kinko. "A History of Manga in the Context of Japanese Culture and Society." *The Journal of Popular Culture*. 38:3, 2005. 456-475.

Ivy, Marilyn. "Revenge and Recapitation in Recessionary Japan," *The South Atlantic Quarterly*. 99:4, 2000. 819-840.

Kinsella, Sharon. *Adult Manga; Culture and Power in Contemporary Japanese Society*. Surrey, England : Curzon Press, 2000.

Laqueur, Walter. *Fascism; Past, Present, and Future*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1996.

Liu, Joyce. "Do You Want to Cleanse Your Heart and Change an Identity? Immanentism and the Psyche Politics in Colonial Taiwan." Presented at the Conference on "The Question of Asia in the New Global Order." *Asia/Pacific Studies Institute, Duke University*, Oct. 1-2, 2004.

Mauss, Marcel. "Gift, Gift." *Logic of the Gift; Toward an Ethic of Generosity*, ed. Alan D. Schrift. New York : Routledge, 1997. 28-32.

Napier, Susan. *Anime from Akira to Princess Mononoke; Experiencing Contemporary Japanese Animation.* New York : Palgrave, 2001.

Noujaim, Jehane, director. *Control Room.* Alliance Atlantis, 2004.

Orwell, George. "'As I please", 17 [What is Fascism?]," *Fascism; Critical Concepts in Political Science, Volume One: the Nature of Fascism*, edited by Roger Griffin, and Matthew Feldman. New York : Routledge, 2004. 49-52.

Payne, Stanley. *The History of Fascism, 1914-1945.* Madison : University of Wisconsin Press, 1995.

Paxton, Robert. "The Five Stages of Fascism," *Fascism; Critical Concepts in Political Science, Volume One: the Nature of Fascism*, edited by Roger Griffin, and Matthew Feldman. New York : Routledge, 2004. 305-326.

Sakai, Naoki. *Translation and Subjectivity; On "Japan" and Cultural Nationalism.* Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Schnapp, Jeffrey T., ed. *A Primer of Italian Fascism.* Trans. Jeffrey T. Schnapp, Olivia E. Sears, and Maria G. Stampino. Lincoln : University of Nebraska Press, 2000.

Schodt, Frederich. *Dreamland Japan; Writings on Modern Manga.* Berkeley : Stone Bridge Press, 1996.

Shenfield, Stephen, "Defining 'Fascism.'" From *Fascism; Critical Concepts in Political Science, Volume One: the Nature of Fascism*, edited by Roger Griffin, and Matthew Feldman. New York : Routledge, 2004. 272-290.

Shirane, Haruo, ed. *Early Modern Japanese Literature; An Anthology 1600-1900.* Trans. Haruo Shirane et al. New York : Columbia University Press, 2002.

Spiegleman, Art. *Maus I & II.* New York : Pantheon Books, 1973.

Tanaka, Yuki. *Hidden Horrors: Japanese War Crimes in World War II.* Colorado : Westview Press, 1998.

Ueno, Chizuko. "The Politics of Memory; Nation, Individual, and Self," *History & Memory.* 11:2, 1999. 129-152.

Yoshimi Yoshiaki. *The Comfort Women,* trans. Suzanne O'Brien. Columbia University Press, 2002.

Zizek, Slavoj. *Organs Without Bodies; On Deleuze and Consequences.* New York : Routledge, 2004.

News Articles

French, Howard L. "Japan's Resurgent Far right Tinkers with History," *New York Times, Late Edition (East Coast),* Mar 25, 2001.

McCurry, Justin. 2005. "Textbook Crimes." The Guardian Unlimited [online]. April 22nd. Available at http://www.guardian.co.uk/china/story/0,7369,1466674,00.html>

McNeill, David. 2005. "Chinese Rebuff Japan's Attempts to Ease Tension." The Independent Online Edition. April 18th. <http://news.independent.co.uk/world/asia/story.jsp?story=630524>

Watts, Jonathan. 2005. "Violence Flares as The Chinese Rage At Japan," *The Observer* [online]. April 17th. <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/international/story/0,,1461648,00.html>

"Anti-Japan rallies spread to Shenyang, Shenzen." The Asahi Shimbun [online]. April 18th, 2005. <http://www.asahi.com/english/Herald-asahi/TKY200504180104.html>

"China Allows More Protests in Shanghai Against Japan" New York Times [online]. April 17th, 2005. Available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/04/17/international/asia/17china.html?ex=1114920000&en=3fbc97509cd7fc3f&ei=5070>.

"Japan anger at Shanghai Violence." BBC News [online]. April 16th, 2005. Available at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/ 1/hi/world/asia-pacific/4452097.stm>

"Japanese PM apologizes for war." CNN News. April 22nd, 2005. Available at http://edition.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/asiapcf/04/22/china.japan.koizumi/index.html

"Japanese Textbook Rarely Used." CNN News [online]. April 14th, 2005. Available at <http://edition.cnn.com/2005 /WORLD/asiapcf/04/14/japan .textbook.ap/

"Protests Staged in 71 Countries Over Textbook," The Korea Times, June 13, 1998. Taken from *the International Movement Against all Forms of Discrimination and Racism* (IMAFDR) Available at <http://www.imadr.org/attention/news2001.1-2.html>

"Taiwan boycotts Japanese comic," *CNN News* [online], Feb. 23rd, 2001. Available at <http://edition.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/asiapcf/east/02/23/taiwan.comic.01/>.

"What Chinese Textbooks Don't Say." CNN News [online]. April 17th, 2005. Available at <http://edition.cnn.com/2005 /WORLD/asiapcf/04/14/japan .textbook.ap/>

Appendix A - Original Japanese Text

(Note: Because a majority these quotations are taken from manga text, I have had to make a few adjustments in punctuation in order to make understanding of the texts in this format easier. Kobayashi often omits periods and commas from his text, depending on a separation of the text from one line to another or one frame to another to do the work that punctuation would. In order to make reading of the Japanese easier, I have had to re-insert periods and commas back into the text where appropriate. Also I need to make a distinction between my use of "..." vs. ". . . " and ". . . . . " I have used "..." to mark areas where I have omitted segments from the original text. ". . . " and ". . . . . " mark where Kobayashi has used periods for expressive effect. Below each quote I have provided the page number the translation appears on in the text above, the name of the person writing or speaking the text, and a reference to the original work and page number in parentheses. KY indicates Kobayashi Yoshinori.)

ところが、最近のよしりんは変だ。絵の代わりに文字が画面を圧倒するようになり、絵そのものもかつての美しさを失いつつある。ギャグのサービスはめっきり減って笑えなくなり、一画面ごとに盛り込まれる情報量も薄っぺらになった。そして何おりも、彼のウニークな直感から繰り出される新鮮な出張がめっきり減り、誰かから借りてきた主張を伝えるものになってしまった。もはやかつてのように、読み終えてからうならせられることが僕はほとんどなくなってしまった。
From Page 16-17, Uesugi Satoshi, (*The Post Arrogantist Manifesto*, 13)

私は、もう『ゴーマニズム宣言』の手法が無効になっているのではないかと気の毒にさえ思うのである。それに余計なお世話だが、あなたの絵は、戦争中、中国人が配布した日本軍の非道さを宣伝するビラのイラストそっくりになってきている、気をつけたほうがいい。もうひとつ、「新しい歴史教科書をつくる会」などすみやかに脱会することをおすすめする。小林よしのりに【会】など似合わないからだ。
From page 17, Yū Miri, (*The Post Arrogantist Manifesto*, 13)

「反小林」の人達に共通する性向として「私が正しいと主張したがることがある。「小林は間違っている」「小林はインチキなやつだ」「私が正しい」「私の方が正しい」「私が正しいはずなのに人々はなぜ小林を見る？」「私がこんなに正しいではないか！？」...アホとして言いようがないね。そんなこと一読者が決めるこった。それより人が正しいたけの者についていきますか？結構知識人の中にもこの「正しいはずの私にこそ耳を傾けるべきだ」とだけ思ってイラついている人は多い。

From page 40-41, KY, (*The New Arrogantist Manifesto 6*, 18)

日本政府（東条英機内閣）は開戦直後の一九四一年十二月一〇日、この戦争を「大東亜戦争」と呼ぶと決定し、十二日、戦争の目的は「大東亜新秩序」の建設にあると説明しました。ですから、この呼び方には、「大東亜共栄圏」建設のための「聖戦」、アジア解放のための正しい戦争という意味が込められています。現在も、当時の言い習わしから、無意識に、あるいは慣習的に「大東亜戦争」と呼ぶ人もいますが、こうした呼び方は、むしろ意識的にこの戦争を肯定しようとする立場と結び付いてきました。なお、戦争はこの戦争をアメリカの影響で「太平洋戦争」と呼んできたのですが、最近、中国・東南アジアを含む戦争であることを示すため、「アジア太平洋戦争」という呼び方が広まっています。
From page 44, Obinata Sumio, (*Are you Willing to Die for Your Country*, 14-15)

著者が忘れたこと、それは人間にとって最も重要な価値が、国家権力のために死ぬことではなく、生命の尊重にあるという近代社会の出発点以来の考え方であろう。
From page 46, Arakawa Shōji, ("The Ingenuity of Inviting Readers...," 197)

このような議論は小林よしのり氏だけでなくて、その源流は「自由主義史観」を標榜して登場した藤岡信勝氏にあると思います。
From page 53, Ishiyama Hisao, (*Are You willing to Die For Your Country*,149)

...戦争の廃絶と平和のための努力の歴史的な到達点をまったく踏まえず...
From page 53, Ishiyama Hisao , (Ibid. 186)

これは私の愛する漫画家・小林よしのり氏への鎮魂の書である。もちろん彼が肉体的に死んだわけではない。だが、精神は死ぬことがある。ここでは、漫画家としての精神の死を悼んでいる。
From page 54, Uesugi Satoshi, (*The Post-Arrogantist Manifesto*, 1)

戦後日本が「国家」を否定し「公」の基準を見つけられぬままにあらゆる共同体を否定して個人主義に向かっていった帰結が...大人から子供まで徹底した「公共性」の喪失だ！
From page 73-74, KY, (*On War*, 101)

「左翼のために」でも「サヨクのために」でも「個人のために」でもない。「公のために」だ！「公のために」は「国のために」と言いかえても同じではないだろうか？「国のために」部落差別なんてあっちゃいけない...「国のために」オウムは危険だし宗教を聖域にしてはいけない...「国のために」マルクス主義的反日教科書を子供に与えたままでは絶対にいけない。左翼は「国のために」より「人権のために」「平等社会のために」が上位に来るだろう。さらに「反戦平和のた

めに」21世紀は国家がなくなってしったほうがいいと考える...左翼も「公のために」を考えているのだろうが、その公の範囲が「国」ではない。「世界」なのだ。わしは「国」だ。左翼およびサヨクは「世界」だ.
From page 74-75, KY, (*On War*, 342-343)

この「残存左翼」に操られやすいのが「うす甘いサヨクの市民グループ」だ。明確な左翼思想を持つわけでなく...人権・平等・自由・フェミニズム・反戦平和などの思想が彼らを突き動かす…ここでわしはマルクス主義の影響のある者を「左翼」と漢字で書き…無意識に「人権」などの価値に引きずられ反権力・反国家・市民主義になる者を「サヨク」とカタカナで書く。
From page 74, KY (*On War*, 23-25)

大井満著『仕組まれた南京大虐殺』からの引用である。よく「女子供の死体まであった」とかいう証言があるが女子供が便衣兵なら殺されたって仕方がない。
From page 76, KY (*On War* 128)

その当時に生まれ、その当時の状況の中でおまえがリーダーだったら戦争を避けて、アメリカ帝国主義やソ連・支那の共産勢力から日本を守れる策がだせたのか？「出せた」といっても、まったく無意味だ。人は時代の条件と気分の中にしか存在しない。時代の必然性を無視して「失敗しやがって」と言える者こそが無責任で信用ならない連中なのだ。
From page 75, KY (*On War*, 33)

日本軍は兵隊の命を祖末に扱いすぎた。そしてなにせ戦争なのだから粗暴になる兵隊もいて軍規違反で悲惨なこともしただろう。それら否定的な側面をすべて反省したとしても．．．．それでも有色人種を下等なサルとしか思ってなくて、東アシアを植民地にしていた差別主義欧米列強の白人どもに．．．目にもの見せてくれた日本軍には拍手なのである。
From page 75, KY (*On War*, 29-30)

つまりわしは『個』を守ったにすぎない。「公のために」特攻隊は命を捨て「個のために」わしはプライドを捨てた。特攻隊もわしも負けを覚悟決死で敵に挑んでいくのだが．．．守るべきものは全然違っていた。
From page 79, KY (*On War*, 92)

こうしてみんながわしのことを誤解しだしたのは『戦争論』を描いて以降だった。マルクス主義者や反国家主義者サヨクマスコミがこんな言い方をしたからだ．．．戦争を美化している。わしは祖国を守るために若者が発揮した勇気は称えたが．．．戦争のものを美化した覚えはない。
From page 80, KY (*On War*, 37)

学生に何ができるんだ？真相究明も恒久対策も、後は弁護士や医者や検察や政治家やジャーナリストらのプロの領域だろう。おまえらアマチュアが具体的に何ができるんだ？
From page 81, KY, (*On Post Righteousness*, 84)

「ファシズム」には本来「束ねる」という意味がある。人々は思わず、警戒するような、悪い意味が全てではない。わしはわしの価値観で「束ねる」ことに挑戦する！だからこの本は『わしズム』である！！
From page 83, KY (*Wascism*, 19)

マンガで初めて泣いた。そして気付いた。自分の事だけ良けりゃいいとか、自由が一番と言っていたことに腹が立った。親に本のことを話したら「時代の流れに逆らうな」って言われたけど，悪者でも構わない。逆いってやる。（東京都・１５歳・高校生・男）
From page 85, KY (*New Arrogantist Manifesto 6*, 131)

目の覚めるような気持ちで読みました。日本が戦争について謝罪をしていない、と聞くと「さっさとあやまれば」と思っていた自分の無責任さ、無知さを痛感しています。小林先生、お体に気を付けてがんばって下さい。とても感動しました。（１５歳・中学生）
From page 85-86, KY (*New Arrogantist Manifesto 6*, 113)

そして、三番目の理由は、それまで対立してきた保守評論家・西部邁氏への降伏である。
From page 96, Uesugi Satoshi (*The Post-Arrogantist Manifesto,* 20)

やっぱり癌が勝ってない...サヨナラ...
Frompage 99, KY (*Brute Love*, 185)

人間は矛盾だらけのままでいい！！いっさいの矛盾なく理路整然とした思考はコンピュータかロボットにまかせればいいのだ！しょくん矛盾などおそれるな。ひたすら堂々とゴーマンかますのだ。
From page 103, KY (*Arrogantist Manifesto 1*, 17)

なんでこんなにおどし脅迫が来るのだ！？...その全てがわしの描いた内容を理解していない！ギャグやユーモアというひねった表現が全然わからないらしく勘ちがいして腹を立ている。いろんな人に特にマスコミ関係者に「あんなこと書いて大丈夫でしたか？」「どっかの団体から抗議を受けませんでしたか？」と心配されるが、ちゃんとした団体ならわしの描いとる内容の奥の意味を見抜けるから抗議などないのである。やばいのははっきり言って頭の悪い一変人だ。「あいかわらず、いつもえらそうに書きやがって」と文句つけてくるやつがおるのだ。これはゴーマニズム宣言だぞ！えらそーに書かなきゃケンキョリズム宣言になっちまうじゃないか！「現在に沿った良識ある発言をしろ」良識ある発言だと？この作

品で？マジメにズム宣言じゃねーんだ！だれがそんなものを望んでいるかーっ。わしのファンが暴動おこすぞー！
From page 104-105, KY(*Arrogantist Manifesto 2*, 8-9)

もっとパワーウップして暴風雨のようにゴーマンかましまくってやる！！ただしあくまでもおもしろおかしく楽しくだ！その結果が正論だったりしたらしょーがない。正論なんかわしにとっちゃどーてもいいことじゃい！
From page 105, KY (Ibid. 10)

“正義”のみでやって来る人々はむしろオウム信者的危うい人々か...もしくはイデオロギーで行動している人々なのである。
From page 106, KY (*On Post-Righteousness*, 25)

わかったかなヤングどもよ。そのままでは就職したらたちまち組織に飲み込まれて今度はおまえたちが人を殺す方になるだろう。
From page 107, KY (*On Post-Righteousness*, 93)

健康なヤツは呪われろ！身体のデカイヤツは滅亡しろ！いつの日かこの世を弱者の楽園にするまでわしは闘い続けてやるっ！！
From page 109, KY (*Arrogantist Manifesto 1*, 41)

わしは断った。そんな人の命がかかってることに漫画家が代表として名を連ねるなんて．．．しかも知りあった子供たちがどんどんエイズを発症し死んでいったらどーすんじゃいわしにはたえられん！...代表を引き受けてしまった。ずっと子供漫が絵はいてきた者の弱みだ。子供に借りを返さにゃならん。
From page 109-110, KY (*On Post-Righteousness*, 16)

皆が班を作った。皆が机にお昼ごはんの準備した。みんな楽しそうー。ところでぼくはどうなるんだろう？すごく心細くてすごくみじめで．．．．．消えてしまいたい．．．．．けれど．．．この子がいた！そうだ、そうだ。いつもこの子も取り残されてはぐれてるんだ！だって、この子知恵足らずだもん。わしはほっとする。一人じゃないぞ、この子が一緒だ！むこうも安心してる「よかった。この子がいてくれてよかった．．．」この子ぱーだけど今は仲間だ。二人の間に暖かい何かが流れていた．．．「あらまー。どーしたの。仲良しの子いないの？だれかこの子たち班に入れてあげてー」「あっ。よしのりちゃん、こっちこっちこっちおいでー」「あっ、あの子この前ぼくに声かけてきた子だ。」「ほーら。よかったね、よしのりちゃん。宮本くんがいれてくれるって」あーっ、ぱーの子がすごい不安な顔してる。けどぼくは呼ばれたんだもん．．．ふつーの子たちの仲間に入れるんだもん。ぼく知らないよ。君のこと裏切ってしまうけど．．．．．ぼくが悪いんじゃない！ぼくはふつーの子たちに混じってしまえるんだもん。ぼくはいくから。ごめんね。ごめんね。ごめんね。今でもあの時のことを思い出すと胸が苦しい。あんな昔からわしって卑怯やったんやね．．．．．
From page 110-111, KY (*On Racism*, 9-12)

このサヨクな空気に逆らうわしは悪党になる。
From page 111, KY (*On War*, 25)

自分の独善性みたいなものをごまかすときには便利だから使うらもしれないですよね。けれども、自分で正義と思っていることを疑ってなきゃいけない。常に疑問符付きで、それでも掲げなきゃいけないんじゃないかっていうようなものですよね。正義がなくていいなんてとても言えない。
From page 112, KY, ("The Failure of a Method...," 200)

こうしてみんながわしのことを誤解しだしたのは『戦争論』を描いて以降だった。マルクス主義者や反国家主義者サヨクマスコミがこんな言い方をしたからだ．．．戦争を美化している。わしは祖国を守るために若者が発揮した勇気は称えたが．．．戦争のものを美化した覚えはない...サヨクの連中の「戦争」を語るための「言葉」そのものが死んでしまっているということにやつらは気づかない。「言葉」が死んでいるから若者に伝わらないんだということがやつらがまだわからない。相変わらずサヨクのわしへの批判の「言葉」は「右翼」「軍国主義」レッテル貼り中国系のマスコミもわしのことをしきりに「軍国主義者小林よしのり」と言って批判している...しかしすごいのは中国でも大陸の漫画家を集めて小林よしのりに対抗する漫画家を養成しようというプランがあるという話が台湾の新聞に出ていたという。「赤い小林よしのり」を作ってわしの『戦争論』や『台湾論』に対抗しようというのか！？しかしなー、わしは国家戦略として作られたわけではない。国家はわしに原稿用紙１枚ペン先１つ提供してはくれない。そもそもわしは反政府・反体制になり得る存在なのだが．．．そんな存在を中国共産党は作り出せるのか！？
From page 113-114, KY (*On War* 2, 37-39)

涙が出ていた。この本を読んで祖父にあやまりたいと思ったからだ。というのは私が小学生３年位の頃、今思えばサヨクが子供の洗脳の為に作った戦争の本を図書館にある団体が寄付した。私はその当時祖父を真剣に怖がりビルマで捕りょになっていたことも「悪いことをしたから当然」と思い、あげくに「おじいちゃんも人殺した？」と聞いた。その時、祖父は悲しいような、でもあきらめているような顔をしたように思う。この本を読んで私は祖父に「ありがとう」と言いたい。そして祖父の為にも自国に誇りを持とうと思う。（１６歳・女子高生）
From page 114-115, KY (*New Arrogantist Manifesto 6*, 116)

うちのじいちゃんが言っていたことが載っていた。中国便衣兵の説明部分だ。「じいちゃん、ごめんな」と謝った。中学、高校のとき、「そんなのはウソや、人殺しまくっとたんやろう」と、よく言っていたからです。その時の顔は妙にさびしげでした。そんな顔するくらいなら、なんで戦争なんかしたんや、という考えでした。でも、この本を読んで本当におどろきました。泣き、怒り、痛快で、

かっこよかった。現在のこの風潮が、とてもくやしいです。（石川県・２５歳・建材業）
From page 115, KY (*New Arrogantist Manifesto 6*, 132)

この戦争の遺児の一人として、父が侵略戦争の手先の如く思われているのが悔しくてたまらなかった。戦争の正当性を含め、善いことも多かったと痛快に論破され、溜飲の下がる思ひで、一気に読ませていただきました。ありがとう御座いました。（山形県・６３歳・会社役員）
From page 115-116, KY (*New Arrogantist Manifesto 6*, 134)

怖くないなんて嘘だが、その時やはり頭に浮かぶのはこの言葉だった、俺は指揮官なんだ！
From page 124, KY (*On War*, 240)

言うまでもなく、わしはマンガ家だ。言論や思想の領域に首を突っ込むようになってはいるけれども、本業はマンガ家だと思っているし、その「分」だけは守ろうとしているつもりだ。だから、間違ったことをいうこともあるだろうし、その場の勢いだけである意見をやっつけてしまうこともあるだろう。あるいは、わしのものの言い方や表現が舌たらずだったり過剰だったりで、わしが伝えたい意図と違う方向にとられることだってあると思う。だから、批評はどんどんやってもらってかまわない。これまでも毎週山ほど届く読者の手紙などにもずっと眼を通してきたし、また、どんな名もない人の意見でも聞くべきところは謙虚に聞こうと思ってきた。それは今でも変わっていないつもりだ。
From page 127, KY (*The Asahi Newspaper's Sense of Right*, 10)

「厚生省にバズーカ砲か．．．．．それもいいな．．．」と思ってしまったのだ。「劇的だな、絵になる．．．．．」
From page 128, KY (*On Post-Righteousness*, 45)

しかし日本の女性にだって悲惨な過去はあるのだ。満州にソ連軍が攻めてきた時、日本女性はソ連兵に夫や家族の前で犯され阿鼻叫喚の地獄絵図。この時身ごもった女性は自決したり、博多の引き揚げ者収容所で中絶したり、したらしい。しかしこれらの日本女性はその後貝のように口を閉じ、決して語らず、胸に秘め、その事実すらなかったかのようになっている．．．日本の女は凄い！わしはこのような女を誇りに思う。
From page 133-134, KY (*New Arrogantist Manifesto* 3, 21)

無邪気に男の子の感覚で言えば、グレイトなのである。「いっぱい犠牲者が出たんだぞ」と善良な人たちに怒られたって．．．ウルトラマンが怪獣と戦ってるのを見て「すげえ」と言っている子に．．．「このビルの下にはいっぱい犠牲者がいるんだぞ」と怒るようなもので．．．そんな偽善者のきれいごとなんか。
From page 135-136, KY (*On War*, 29)

ものすごい怒りがこみあげてきました。この怒りをサヨク達やアメリカ、中国の人達にぶつけたいが、ただの高校生で、何の発言力もない自分に腹が立った．もし自分が大人になった時に、まだこの問題が残っていたら「バカヤロー、ちがうじゃねえか！」と公の場で発言できるような職なり、知識なりを身つけておこうと思いました。（１７歳・高校生）

From page 137-138, KY (*On War*, 113)